

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES



ADVISORY BOARD

Prof. M. Buber Prof. D. Daube Prof. M. Ginsberg Prof. Bernard Lewis
Prof. C. Rabin Prof. C. Singer Prof. D. Winton Thomas

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Chairman: Rabbi A. Altmann, M.A., D.Phil.

D. Diringer, M.A., D.Litt. E. Marmorstein, M.A. S. M. Stern, M.A., D.Phil.
S. Stein, Ph.D. J. G. Weiss, M.A. R. J. Z. Werblowsky, B.A., D.ès L.
N. Wieder, Ph.D.

Vol. VIII. Nos. 3 and 4

1957

CONTENTS

L. JACOBS	
THE CONCEPT OF HASID IN THE BIBLICAL AND RABBINIC LITERATURES	143
R. GIVEON	
IN THE VALLEY OF MEGIDDON	155
N. WIEDER	
"SANCTUARY" AS A METAPHOR FOR SCRIPTURE	165
A. EHRMAN	
THE TALMUDIC CONCEPT OF SALE	177
J. MANSOUR	
THE ARABIC DIALECT OF THE JEWS OF BAGHDAD AND THE PRONUNCIATION OF HEBREW	187
J. G. WEISS	
A CIRCLE OF PRE-HASIDIC PNEUMATICS	199
NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS	
ZEEV W. FALK: MUTUAL OBLIGATIONS IN THE KETUBAH ..	215
J. G. WEISS: A CONTEMPORARY POEM ON THE APPEARANCE OF THE ZOHAR.. .. .	219
CURRENT LITERATURE:	223

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES

MANCHESTER

"Stenecourt," Singleton Road, Salford, 7, Lancs.

Telephone: Broughton 4027

Founded in 1953, the Institute is dedicated to the pursuit of scholarly research in the main branches of Jewish learning, including Biblical, Talmudic, and midrashic literature, Jewish philosophy and mysticism, Hasidism and modern Jewish thought. Under the hon. direction of Rabbi Dr. A. Altmann, it comprises a staff of academic experts who are engaged in both research and teaching. "Associates" drawn from prominent Hebrew scholars of various British universities participate in the research programme of the Institute, and attend its seminars for the discussion of their work.

The Institute admits post-graduates as research students, and provides tutorials in the various fields of Jewish studies for them and other advanced students.

The results of the researches undertaken are published in the *Journal of Jewish Studies* and other learned periodicals. Major works are scheduled to appear in a Series of Institute Publications ("Scripta Judaica", Clarendon Press, Oxford).

It is part of the Institute's programme to provide facilities for co-operation between scholars working in the various fields of Jewish studies in the United Kingdom, and to this end arranges conferences from time to time.

The Institute also endeavours to promote a deeper understanding of Judaism in the wider circles of the community and arranges study groups, courses, and extra-mural lectures for university students and others interested.

The programme of the Institute is worked out in consultation with an Academic Advisory Board whose members include Professors C. Rabin (Jerusalem), D. Daube (Oxford), B. Lewis (London), G. Vajda (Paris), J. Weingreen (Dublin), J. M. Yoffey (Bristol), and Dr. D. Diringer (Cambridge).

A limited number of bursaries is available to research students. Applications are to be addressed to the Hon. Director.

The Institute is recognised as a charitable Trust by the Inland Revenue, and contributions can be covenanted. The Governing Body of the Institute comprises prominent Jewish laymen from Manchester and London.

The Prospectus of the Institute is obtainable from the Secretary.

The Concept of *Hasid* in the Biblical and Rabbinic Literatures

WHILE the concept of *hasid* as it appears in the literature concerning the *Hasidim* of Ashkenaz, and more particularly of Beshtian *Hasidism*, has received more or less adequate treatment, no attempt has hitherto been made to trace the evolution of the term in the earlier literature. Lazar Gulkovitsch's valuable monographs on the term in the Biblical and Rabbinic literatures¹ do not really cover the ground—the one dealing chiefly with the concept as it appears in the Psalms, the other with the stories concerning “a certain *hasid*,” most of which are of a later date.

We begin with an examination of the word *hesed*, found in numerous passages in the Bible, meaning mercy, lovingkindness, loyalty, fidelity, grace or charm, according to the context in which it occurs. In two passages² *hesed* appears to mean “shame” or “reproach.” The word occasionally bears this latter meaning in Aramaic and scholars have remarked on the idea of “eager zeal” and “intensity” as basic to its root.³ It is almost as if the ancients, when they used this word, had in mind the very quality of superabundance, which finds its normal expression in the good but which, at times, produces the opposite effect by bursting its bonds.

The practice of *hesed* is a frequently recurring theme in the Biblical books. The prophet Micah speaks of God relinquishing his anger because He delights in *hesed*⁴; the love of *hesed* is an essential ingredient in this prophet's prescription for the good life.⁵ In the books of both Joel and Jonah God is described as “abundant in *hesed*.”⁶ The same appellation is given to God in the book of Exodus.⁷ Jeremiah speaks of God's *hesed* to His

¹ “*Die Entwicklung des Begriffes Hasid im Alten Testament*,” Acta Seminarii Universitatis Tartuensis Judaici, Tartu, 1934, and “*Die Bildung des Begriffes Hasid*,” Tartu, 1935.

² Lev. xx: 17, Prov. xiv: 34. It is possible, however, that in the second passage the word is used in its conventional sense, the meaning being that excessive generosity is out of place in national affairs, v. JULIUS H. GREENSTONE, *Proverbs*, Jewish Pub. Soc., Phil., 1950, p. 159.

³ V. B.D.B. s.v. *hasad*.

⁴ Mic. vii: 18.

⁵ Mic. vi: 8.

⁶ Joel ii: 13; Jonah iv: 2.

⁷ Ex. xxxiv: 6.

people⁸ as well as of Israel's *hesed* to God.⁹ *Hesed* is the keynote of the book of Hosea. The central theme of the book is that God loves Israel whom He has betrothed as His bride in *hesed*¹⁰; therefore He desires *hesed* rather than sacrifice.¹¹ Because of His love for Israel God desires to be worshipped by those who practise *hesed*, that is by those who both reciprocate God's love and whose regard for their fellows is such that every kind of social injustice and iniquity is abhorrent to them.¹² *Hesed* is a kind of spontaneous generation of goodwill in a man's character which makes him delight in giving freely and joyfully to others. Driver and others have commented on the inadequacy of the translation "mercy" for *hesed*. The word possesses no overtones of condescension, nothing patronising or suggestive of affability to inferiors. This efflorescence of character sometimes results in what we call "charm." In the book of Esther the heroine is nowhere described as a beauty. It was her charm which captured the heart of her royal lover.¹³

The word *hasid* is derived from *hesed*. Unlike our English word "saint," from the Latin *sanctus*, the term *hasid* in its original (i.e. Biblical) usage possessed no overtones of consecration or dedication to a special life of extreme holiness and piety. The Biblical *hasid* was certainly no charismatic personality. He was simply one who practised *hesed*,¹⁴ one whose heart and mind were suffused with a rich intensity of goodness resulting in complete devotion to God and unqualified love of his fellow-men. God Himself is described

⁸ Jer. xxxi: 2.

⁹ Jer. ii: 2.

¹⁰ Hos. ii: 21.

¹¹ Hos. vi: 6.

¹² S. L. BROWN ("The Book of Hosea," Westminster Comm., London, 1932, pp. 47-49) rightly points to three usages of the word *hesed*—of God's condescension to the needs of man, of Israel's affection for God, and of men in their relation to each other. Cf. Hos. x: 12-13; xii: 7-8.

¹³ Esther ii: 17. "Rabbi Joshua b. Qorha said: Esther was fallow, but endowed with great charm" (Meg. 13a—lit. "a thread of *hesed* was drawn about her").

¹⁴ Prov. xi: 17 speaks of the "man of *hesed*," so too in Is. lviii: 1 and in 1 Kings xx: 31 "kings of *hesed*." The term 'ish *hesed* may be a synonym for *hasid* but there is probably a distinction between the two terms, the second being the more intensive (our distinction between "So-and-so swims" and "So-and-so is a swimmer"). Briggs and Briggs (I.C.C. to Psalms, Vol. I, p. 34) remark that *hasid* means (i) kind and (ii) pious and godly "because kindness, as prominent in the godly, comes to imply other attributes and be a designation of the godly character." The more plausible explanation is that, as we have seen, the word *hesed*, from which *hasid* is derived, implies intensity of love directed towards both God and man. SCHECHTER's ("Studies in Judaism," 1908, Vol. 2, p. 151) interpretation of *hasidim* as "beautiful souls," on the analogy of the verse in Esther quoted in the previous note, is homiletical and far-fetched.

in the book of Psalms as *ḥasid*.¹⁵ To speak of the Creator as "good" is understandable, as "saintly" is merely grotesque.¹⁶

In the Psalms there are many references to the *ḥasidim*, plural of *ḥasid*.¹⁷ Who were these men? Is the term *ḥasidim* no more than a generic term for the righteous and godly or does it designate a special group of men dedicated to a common purpose? It is impossible to answer this conclusively. When the Psalmist, for instance, refers to God speaking peace to His people and to His saints (*ḥasidim*), are the words "to His saints" in apposition to the words "to His people" or do they refer to a group of saints among the people? Many scholars are inclined to the view that in many of the Psalms the *ḥasidim* are none other than the men of this name who fought with the Maccabees against Antiochus. Psalm one hundred and forty-nine in particular speaks, apparently, of a group of fighting saints.¹⁸

The Biblical *ḥasid* then is not a specially consecrated individual, one set apart from his fellows. He is not a "type" at all, merely an exceptionally good and pious man. It is possible, however, that in the period of the Psalms pious individuals formed groups for the purpose of defending their faith. If this is correct, these men—the *ḥasidim*—may be the group of that name in the time of the Maccabees or they may be a group out of which the latter grew. Of one thing we are certain that in the revolt against Antiochus a company of men joined the ranks of the rebels and they were known as *ḥasidim*. We must now examine the story of these *ḥasidim* in greater detail.

II

The earliest definite references we have to a group of devoted men, calling themselves *ḥasidim*, are in the Books of the Maccabees,

¹⁵ *Ps.* cxlv: 17.

¹⁶ On occasion the *ḥasid* is mentioned in opposition to the "wicked," v. 1 *Sam.* ii: 9; 2 *Sam.* xxii: 26-27, or as parallel to the "upright man," *Micah* vii: 2. It is worthy of note that the feminine of *ḥasid* is not found in the Bible. The form *ḥasidah* (fem. of *ḥasid*) is used of a certain bird in *Lev.* xi: 19; *Deut.* xiv: 18; *Jer.* viii: 7; *Zech.* v: 9; *Ps.* civ: 17; and *Job* xxxix: 13. The A.V. translates the word in all these passages (with the exception of the last which it gives as "ostrich") as "stork." This word may have no connection with *ḥasid* and may not be a Hebrew word at all. R. Hisda's explanation of the word "because it shows kindness (*ḥasiduth*) to its companions" (*Hull.* 63a) is no more than a folk-etymology, v. GULKOWITSCH, op. cit., p. 11 n.l.

¹⁷ *Ps.* lxxxix: 20; L: 5; lxxxix: 2; xxxvii: 28; xcvi: 10.

¹⁸ GULKOWITSCH's (op. cit. p. 18f.) ingenious attempt to trace the development of *ḥasid* and *ḥasidim* in the Psalms from a general term for the whole congregation to the designation of a special *cultic* group is not very convincing because of the difficulty, recognised by him, of accurately dating the various Psalms.

where it is related that these men (*Asidaioi* in Greek) attached themselves to the Maccabees¹⁹ or, according to another version, were the group of which Judas Maccabeus was the captain.²⁰ Scholars have long noted that there is internal evidence (the use of Greek words, for instance) that the book of Daniel was composed during the Greek period. It is a plausible suggestion²¹ that the book was written during the Maccabean revolt to encourage the Jews to remain steadfast in their loyalty to the faith of their fathers. This conjecture finds strong support in the account of Daniel's vision of the "fourth beast" who made war "with the saints."²²

From what has been said it is clear that there is some uncertainty of identification between the *hasidim* of the Psalms and the *hasidim* in the Books of the Maccabees. Are the references in both the Psalms and the Book of the Maccabees to the same group or did the Maccabean group grow out of an earlier group or is it possible that the term *hasidim* in the Psalms is not the name of any particular group? At this late hour these questions can have no final answer. All we can state with certainty is that a group of men known as *hasidim* took a leading part in the Maccabean revolt. It is worthy of note that the Books of the Maccabees do not speak of a group banding itself together in order to fight Antiochus but of a group already formed, apparently for other purposes. Millar Burrows²³ may be right in tracing what he calls an unorganized Puritanical tendency beginning with the Rechabites²⁴ and appearing in the *hasidim* of the later Psalms—the "poor" who trust in God to deliver them—and from this group the Maccabean *hasidim* came.

The spiritual heirs of the Maccabean *hasidim* were the Pharisees, who showed the same devotion to the Law, and particularly the Essenes.²⁵ The Essenes lived a monastic life in which possessions were shared. They dwelt chiefly in the neighbourhood of the Dead

¹⁹ i Macc. ii: 42-44; vii: 8-18.

²⁰ ii Macc. xiv: 3-6.

²¹ ROBERT H. PFEIFFER ("History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha," London, 1949, pp. 13-14) is, however, too confident in stating categorically that the book was composed by a *hasid*.

²² Dan. vii: 19-22, though the Aramaic word used here for saints is *qaddishin*, "the holy ones." Cf. Daniel iii: 17-18 and ARNOLD TOYNBEE'S "An Historian's Approach to Religion," O.U.P., 1956, pp. 100-101 who remarks that possibly the first to have laid down their lives for the sake of a god who was not some form of collective human power were the Jewish martyrs who suffered under the Seleucid Monarchy in 167 B.C.

²³ "An Outline of Biblical Theology," Phil., 1946, pp. 151-2.

²⁴ Jer. xxxv: 6-7.

Continued at foot of next page

Sea and the Dead Sea Scrolls appear to have been produced by the members of this sect. When not working, these saints—Philo says that they were about four thousand in number—engaged in religious study and prayer. To positively identify the Essenes with the Maccabean Asideans or to ascribe to them the Book of Jubilees, Enoch and other books is, however, precarious due to the paucity of the evidence.²⁶

There are a number of references in the Rabbinic literature to the "Pious Men of Old"—*ḥasidim ha-rishonim*. These may have been the Essenes (of whom, incidentally there is no direct mention in the Talmudic literature) or, possibly, the earlier Maccabean group. It is said that the "Pious Men of Old" would wait one hour before their prayers in order to direct their minds to God;²⁷ they would insert the fringes to be worn on the corners of the garment²⁸ as soon as three handbreadths of the garment had been woven, although the Law does not demand that these be affixed until the garment is to be worn;²⁹ and they would only consort with their wives on a Wednesday in the belief that a conception on any other day might result in a birth on the Sabbath which would involve a certain amount of Sabbath desecration³⁰ (this is allowed by law but the exceedingly pious took the most extreme steps in order to avoid Sabbath desecration). The same scrupulous regard displayed by these men in connection with their religious duties was shown in their sense of social responsibility. It was their practice to hide their thorns and broken glass in the midst of their fields at a depth of three handbreadths and so guard against the possibility of anything belonging to them doing harm to others.³¹ Although one or two

²⁶ BÜCHLER: "Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety From 70 B.C.E. to 70 C.E. The Ancient Pious Men," Jews' College Publication, No. 8, O.U.P., 1922, p. 8, note 2.

²⁷ *Mish. Ber.* v: 1, cf. *Ber.* 32b.

²⁸ *Num.* xv: 37-41.

²⁹ *Men.* 41a.

³⁰ *Nidd.* 38b. This would appear to rule out the identification of the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim* with the Essenes who were celibates. But if there are records of the Essenes in the Dead Sea Scrolls, it would seem that one branch of the order did not insist on celibacy, for there are references to women members.

³¹ SCHÜRER ("Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi," 1901-3, Vol. II, 655) has shown how the word Essenes may be a Greek form of the word *ḥasidim*. Cf. *J.E.* Vol. v, pp. 224-232, and W. O. E. Oesterley: "The Jews and Judaism During the Greek Period," London, 1941, pp. 256-257. Recently, however, I. F. BAER, *Zion*, 1952, Vol. XVII, p. 43, has shown that the word is found in early Greek sources with the meaning of "king" or "official" and the possible meaning of "holy man."

Continued at foot of next page

of the details may be later embellishments, there is no reason for doubting the authenticity of these accounts from which there emerges the picture of a group of men careful, with a scrupulosity extending far beyond the letter of the law, in matters of prayer, of Sabbath observance, of ritual in general and of social welfare. The looser Biblical term is now used of the members of a special pietistic group.

Reference must here be made to the important researches of I. F. Baer on the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim* in Philo³² and on their contribution to the early *Halakhah*.³³ Philo³⁴ speaks of an ancient tradition concerning the saintly men of former days who led lives of exemplary piety in close communion with God and he looks forward to the re-emergence of this type. Baer has no difficulty in demonstrating that this tradition is paralleled in the Rabbinic sources and that Philo's pattern is the Jewish *ḥasid* rather than the Greek sage. But Baer too readily identifies these men with both the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim* and the Essenes. Philo appears to speak in more general terms of mankind's fall from grace so that the saintly men of old have almost ceased to exist. But there is no conclusive reference in Philo to a definite group such as the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim*. And we have noted above that it is precarious to identify these latter with the Essenes.³⁵

Baer³⁶ makes the fascinatingly original suggestion that much of the early *Halakhah* was not the product of the schools but was evolved by a Community of farmer-saints in response to the immediate demands of a more or less primitive, rural culture and he points to some remarkable Greek parallels. This theory cannot be lightly

³² *Ha-ḥasidim ha-rishonim be-khitheve Philon u-vamasoreth ha-'ivrit*, Zion, 1953, Vol. XVIII, pp. 91-108.

³³ *Ha-yesodoth ha-historiim shel ha-halakhah*, Zion, 1952, Vol. XVII, pp. 1-55.

³⁴ *De Specialibus Legibus*, II, 42-55 and *Quod Omnis Probus Liber*.

³⁵ BAER, for instance, quotes the Mishnah, *Soṭ.* ix: 9, in which it is said that when Jose b. Joezer of Šeredah and Jose b. Johanan of Jerusalem died, the grape-clusters (*eshkoloth*) ceased and considers these to have belonged to the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim* (op. cit. p. 92). He later quotes a saying of Jose as a typical doctrine of the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim* (p. 100). But while BAER is undoubtedly correct in remarking on the early Rabbinic tradition of saintly men who were no more, there is a certain amount of confusion in positively identifying these with the specific group known as *ḥasidim ha-rishonim*. It is nowhere said that Jose belonged to the latter group.

³⁶ *Ha-yesodoth*.

³⁷ *B.Q.* 30a. In the minor tractate *Semahoth* (iii: 10) it is said in the name of R. JUDAH (second century) that the *ḥasidim* of old used to die of a bowel disease which purged them so that they entered Paradise in purity.

dismissed. But even if Baer is correct in this, it would appear to be more plausible to consider the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim* as a definite group in such a Community rather than to identify the whole pre-Tannaitic Community with the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim*. In any event there is no direct evidence for such an identification.

Reverting to the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim*, it is clear that the group was no longer in existence in the Tannaitic period,³⁷ and in this period the term *ḥasid* denotes the exceedingly pious individual outstanding for his love of God and man and his punctiliousness in the observance of his religious and ethical duties. The *ḥasid* is now the equivalent of the saint.³⁸

III

The best introduction to the Rabbinic conception of the *ḥasid* is to examine the instances of saintly behaviour recorded in the ethical treatise, 'Aboth. Included as they are in the official code of law, the Mishnah, these teachings have a special significance.

The first mention of the *ḥasid* in this book is in a saying ascribed to Hillel that the ignorant man (*'am ha'areš*) cannot be a *ḥasid*.³⁹ In the same chapter the names of R. Joḥanan ben Zakkai's five disciples are given and one of them, R. Jose the Priest, is described as a *ḥasid*.⁴⁰ When the disciples were urged by their master to "go out and see" the good way a man should choose and the evil way he should shun, R. Jose said he ought to choose a good neighbour and avoid an evil one.⁴¹ The saying attributed to Jose is: "Let the property of thy fellow be dear to thee as thine own; and fit thyself for the study of the Torah, for it is not thine by inheritance; and let all thy deeds be done for the sake of Heaven."⁴² Here the essence of saintliness is apparently good neighbourliness and disinterestedness.

³⁷ This is implied in the words "The Pious Men of Old." The saying that when R. Jose Qatnutha died, there were no more saintly ones (*Soṭ.* ix: 14) may mean that he belonged to the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim*.

³⁸ The first chapter in BÜCHLER's book (op. cit.) is entitled "Hillel, the *Ḥasid*," which suggests that in this author's view the *ḥasidim ha-rishonim* were still in existence in Hillel's day and that he belonged to their number. BÜCHLER's proof that Hillel was a *ḥasid* is based on the account in *Jer. T. Soṭ.* ix: 24b and *Tosephta*, *Soṭ.* xiii: 3 that when Hillel died they bewailed him thus: "Woe for the humble, the saint, the disciple of Ezra." But here the term *ḥasid* is used as a generic one and is, in fact, the common form of eulogy for the good man; v. *Ber.* 6b where it is stated that this form was used of the man who "sets aside a place for his prayers." Cf. BACHER, *Tannaim*, Vol. 1, p. 6, n. 1.

³⁹ ii: 6.

⁴⁰ ii: 8.

⁴¹ ii: 9.

⁴² ii: 12.

An anonymous teaching in a later chapter of 'Aboth describes saintliness as intensity of virtuous behaviour. Of the four characters among men the *hasid* is he who says: "What is mine is thine and what is thine is thine."⁴³ Of the four kinds of tempers the *hasid* is he whom it is hard to provoke and easy to pacify.⁴⁴ Of the four types of almsgiver the *hasid* gives and wishes others to give.⁴⁵ Of the four who frequent the House of Study the *hasid* is he who goes and also practises.⁴⁶

From the above sayings we notice that the *hasid* is not content with minimum standards of conduct but resolves to go far beyond the letter of the law. This idea is found in a number of Rabbinic sources. Thus the ruling is given that the victim of a fraudulent change of money can return the deficient coins he received providing that the return is made during a limited period in which he can ascertain their true value. If they are not returned within this period it is assumed that the victim waives his right. But a ruling of the Mishnah is quoted from which it appears that the time limit is extended for as long as a year. To this R. Hisda (*d.* 309 C.E.) replies that the longer period is in accordance with the "rule of saintliness"—*mishnath hasidim*.⁴⁷ Similarly, if a wealthy man travelling from place to place and finding himself without money is obliged to take poor relief, he is not obliged to make restitution on his return home, for at that time he was, in fact, a poor man. But another ruling is quoted in which it is said that he is obliged to make restitution. Again R. Hisda replies that this latter ruling is for saints.⁴⁸ In these two examples it is of interest that the "saintly rule" is said to be recorded in the Mishnah. Whether the interpretation of the Mishnah in this fashion is historically correct is beside the point. It remains true that in the view of R. Hisda the official code of Jewish law, while stating the minimum requirements of that law, occasionally offers guidance to those who want to behave as the saints are expected to do in going beyond the letter of the law. In other words, the "saintly rule" is not a mere individual preference but an actual code of conduct.⁴⁹

In this connection the following anecdote told in the Jerusalem Talmud is important. The Mishnah rules that a company of Jews

⁴³ v: 10.

⁴⁴ v: 11.

⁴⁵ v: 13.

⁴⁶ v: 14.

attacked by heathen may save their lives by handing over one of their number if the heathen had specified him by name. R. Joshua b. Levi followed this teaching and saved the lives of the inhabitants of his town by handing over a man specified by name. Whereupon Elijah who was wont to appear to the saint did so no longer. After R. Joshua had fasted many days Elijah appeared and rebuked him. Joshua defended his action by referring to the clear rule of the Mishnah. "Yes," replied Elijah, "but is this a *mishnath ḥasidim*?"⁵⁰

The difference between the formally righteous—the *ṣaddiq*—and the *ḥasid* is then that the *ḥasid* goes beyond the letter of the law. R. Huna (late third century C.E.) contrasted the two parts of the verse: "The Lord is righteous (*ṣaddiq*) in all His ways" and "and gracious (*ḥasid*) in all His works."⁵¹ At first God acts with sinners according to their just deserts but in the end He is gracious to pardon, i.e. He goes beyond the letter of the law.⁵² There was a widespread belief shared by the Rabbis that the parings of fingernails can be injurious to the health of a pregnant woman who stepped over them. The man who throws his nail-parings away is wicked, he who buries them is a *ṣaddiq*, but the *ḥasid* burns them, i.e. he avoids the remotest possibility of them doing harm.⁵³

An important factor which emerges from the passages quoted above from 'Aboth is the connection between saintliness and learning. Professor Scholem, in his study of the *Ḥaside Ashkenaz*, remarks that, for them, to be a *ḥasid* was to conform to purely religious standards entirely independent of intellectualism and learning. "For while Ḥasidism continued to place a premium on knowledge, it was nevertheless possible to be a *ḥasid* without an understanding of more than, say, the text of the Bible." Scholem considers this to be a departure from the older Rabbinic view of *ḥasiduth*.⁵⁴ But

⁵⁰ Jer. T. Ter. VIII: 46c.

⁵¹ Ps. cxlv: 17.

⁵² R.H. 17b.

⁵³ M.Q. 18b, cf. B.Q. 30a for the *ḥasid* who rebuked the man who threw the stones of his field into the public domain.

⁵⁴ "Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism," 3rd ed., London, 1955, p. 91.

⁴⁷ B.M. 52b.

⁴⁸ Hull 130b.

⁴⁹ But it would be too hasty to conclude that in the *mishnath ḥasidim* we have an unconscious recollection of the early primitive Halakhah as described by BAER (cited on page 148). BAER (*Ha-yesodoth* p. 55) states that the laws governing *dine shamayim* require further investigation on the basis of his theory but there is a clear distinction between *dine shamayim*, which are a kind of higher law for all men, and the *mishnath ḥasidim*, which is a code of conduct for saints, cf *Encyclopedia Talmudith*, Vol. VII, pp. 382-395.

while Scholem is probably right that the divorce between learning and saintliness was especially pronounced among the *Ḥaside Ashkenaz* the tendency can be observed in the Rabbinic literature also. Hillel's saying that the *'am ha'areš* cannot be a *ḥasid* means no more than that the ignorant *ḥasid* is far from this teacher's ideal. A parallel saying of Hillel, quoted in the same passage is that a quick-tempered man cannot teach, i.e. he is not the ideal teacher! The saying that "he who studies and practises is a *ḥasid*" does not mean that he who does not study cannot be considered a *ḥasid*. The meaning is clearly that *of the four who frequent the House of Study* the *ḥasid* is he who both studies and practises. In fact, the Rabbis refer to the ignorant *ḥasid*.⁵⁵ A further interesting example of the antagonism of the *ḥasid* and the scholar in Rabbinic times is to be found in the following passage: "A *tanna* recited before Rabbah son of R. Huna: If one kills snakes and scorpions on the Sabbath, the spirit of the *ḥasidim* is displeased with him. He retorted, As to those *ḥasidim*, the spirit of the Sages is displeased with them."⁵⁶ There are many references to pious men of note in the Rabbinic literature who are renowned for their saintliness but never feature as teachers of the *Halakhah*, such as Ḥoni Ha-Me'agel, Ḥanina b. Dosa and 'Amram Ḥasida. It is clear beyond doubt that though these men were held in high esteem, the scholar was considered to be their superior. The distinction between the two types is expressed penetratingly in the anecdote of Ḥanina b. Dosa praying successfully for the son of Joḥanan b. Zakkai, though Joḥanan's own prayer went unheeded. Joḥanan stated that this was not due to Ḥanina's superiority to him but because he was like a nobleman before the king while Ḥanina was like a servant of the king who can enter into his presence at any time to arrange the palace furniture.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ "Even if a scholar is vengeful and bears malice like a serpent, gird him on thy loins; whereas even if an *'am ha'areš* is a *ḥasid*, do not dwell in his vicinity." (*Sabb.* 63a).

⁵⁶ *Sabb.* 121b. ABELSON, in his article on Jewish saintliness (*E.R.E.*, Vol. II, pp. 62-63) is consequently far off the mark when he writes: "One possession, however, is indispensable to him—learning. The saint must be a man of learning; and only a man of learning can be a saint."

⁵⁷ *Ber.* 34b, v. *Rashi* ad. loc. The *Zohar* (II, 15a) tells a similar anecdote about R. Eleazar and R. Akiba but there the prayer of the inferior is answered because the king wants to keep the superior by him as long as possible. In the *Zoharic* explanation the superior, too, is a man of prayer, no doubt because of the different scale of values in Kabbalistic thought. It remains true that generally in Talmudic thought the scholar is a different type from the man of prayer and is superior to the latter. Cf. the Rabbinic statement that a scholar is greater than a prophet, *B.B.* 12a.

The truth of the matter is that basically the approach of the *ḥasid* is bound to be at variance with that of the official teachers of the *Halakhah*. This antagonism, it is well known, flared into open conflict at a much later period with the rise of Beshtian *Hasidism*. At a slightly earlier period to the Besht, Moses Hayyim Luzzatto is obliged to remark, in the introduction to his famous manual of saintliness, *Mesilath Yesharim*, that *ḥasiduth* is frequently equated with practises such as the lengthy recitation of Psalms and ritual ablutions and that saintliness is rarely to be found among the learned who believe that no intellectual effort is required for its attainment.⁵⁸

Sometimes in the Rabbinic literature the term *ḥasid* is used very loosely to signify simply a good or pious man, a reversion to the original Biblical usage. It is in this sense that the word is used when it is said that most sailors are *ḥasidim*.⁵⁹ But generally the word conveys the idea of that special kind of virtue carried to abundance that is the hall-mark of the saint. In the examples given above special stress is laid on *ḥasiduth* in prayer, in self-improvement and in the care of a neighbour's property. So that the third century Babylonian teacher, Rabh Judah, said that he who wishes to be a *ḥasid* must fulfil the laws dealt with in the Order *Neziqin* (treating of damages and how to avoid injury to others). Raba (299-352) said that he must fulfil the matters dealt with in the ethical treatise 'Aboth. While others say that he must fulfil the matters dealt with in tractate *Berakhoth*, which has prayer for its subject.⁶⁰

It is hoped that we have succeeded in showing that there is a gradual development of the concept of *ḥasid* from the Biblical down through the Rabbinic period. The stages of this development can be traced in the sources. The *ḥasid* in the Bible is simply the good man who leads the good life in the sight of God and man, though with an intensity of virtue which distinguishes him from his fellows. During the Maccabean period we find the name given to the members of a pietistic group. This group may be that referred to in the Talmud under the name "The Pious Men of Old" but it was no longer in existence in the Tannaitic period. During this, and the later Rabbinic period, the *ḥasid* was the man of special sanctity,

⁵⁸ WILLIAM JAMES ("The Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 340) after a careful analysis of the one-sidedness of saints, concludes: "In the life of saints, technically so called, the spiritual faculties are strong, but what gives the impression of extravagance proves usually, on examination, to be a relative deficiency of intellect."

⁵⁹ *Qidd.* iv: 14.

altruism and holiness, particularly noted for his desire to go far beyond the letter of the law. With the addition of mystical and ascetic elements of various kinds the *ḥasid* in subsequent Jewish life and thought belongs to this later Rabbinic type.

London

L. JACOBS

⁶⁰ *B.Q.* 30a. Some further Rabbinic ideas on *ḥasiduth* might here be mentioned. Of the people assembled in the Temple courtyard for the ceremony of the drawing of the water, the *ḥasidim* used to say: "Happy our youth that has not disgraced our old age" while the penitents used to say: "Happy our old age which has atoned for our youth" (*Sukk.* 53a). This would seem to suggest that the title *ḥasid* was given only to the man whose life had been untainted by sin, not to the penitent. In fact, in the Rabbinic discussion as to whether the perfectly righteous or the penitent is greater (*Ber.* 34b) the term used for the righteous is *ṣaddiq*, not *ḥasid*. (Cf. *Zohar* I, p. 39a where it is said that the penitent occupies a higher place in the celestial halls than the perfectly righteous, but that the highest place of all is reserved for the *ḥasid*.) On the other hand, Adam is described as a great *ḥasid* who mortified himself for his sin (*'Erub.* 18b). Among the later *Ḥasidim* of Ashkenaz penitence appears to have been an essential ingredient in the saintly life, v. SCHOLEM op. cit. p. 104f. Though self-denial is frequently attendant on saintliness in the Rabbinic, and more particularly in the later, literature, the saint has no desire to extend the principle of self-denial to others. Thus David is described as a *ḥasid* who gave ritual decisions in order "to render a woman clean for her husband" (*Ber.* 4a). A later Rabbi, commenting on R. Akiba's teaching that the ten tribes have no share in the life to come, said that Akiba had abandoned his *ḥasiduth* (*Sanh.* 110b). *Ḥasiduth* here involves a special regard for others which finds redeeming features in those whom strict justice would condemn. An interesting speculation is whether the term *ḥasid* is used of non-Jews. The current term "the *ḥasidim* among the nations" (found in JELLINEK'S *Beth Ha-Midrash* III, *Seder Gan 'Eden*, MAIMONIDES, *Hil. Melakhim*, VIII: 11 and BERTINORO to *Sanh.* x: 2) is late. The original reading in *Tos. Sanh.* xiii: 2, is "the *ṣaddiqim* of the nations" (v. ZUCKERMANDEL'S ed., Pasewalk 1881 and GULKOWITSCH op. cit., pp. 11-13). On the other hand Job is described as a *ḥasid* (v. *B.B.* 15b) though according to some Rabbis he was not a Jew and Adam, too, is described as a *ḥasid* (*'Erub.* 18b).

“In the Valley of Megiddon”

(Zech. xii : ii)

(Notes on the Historical Geography of the Region East of Megiddo)

THE distance between Megiddo and Taanach is about three miles. These two important towns ruled over the lesser settlements situated between them at all times. There was no lack of agricultural soil in the district. The name of the near-by Arab village of Um-el-Fahm (“Mother of Coal”) reminds us of the vast forests in which charcoal was burned. Another hint of the existence of forests in the territory of the tribes of Manasseh and Issachar can be found in *Josh.* xvii: 17-18a:

“And Joshua spoke unto the house of Joseph, even to Ephraim and to Manasseh, saying: thou art a great people and hast great power: thou shalt not have one lot only. But the mountains shall be thine; for it is wood, and thou shalt cut it down: and the outgoings of it shall be thine.”

The numerous wine and oil presses that have been discovered show that at least in Roman and Byzantine times this advice was followed in a way which left permanent traces.

However, the identity of the towns or villages in this region is still an unsolved question. From lists of towns and from other Biblical and non-Biblical sources we know of a considerable number of settlements which have to be placed in this region. In the following we shall attempt to place some of these.

Our external sources for the pre-Israelite history of the region are the Tell-el-Amarna letters, the Annals of Thutmosis III and the Taanach letters. The oldest of these, the Thutmosis annals, mention Taanach by name. The generals of the king advise him to take the Taanach road as an alternative to the direct approach to Megiddo, the centre of the hostile Canaanite coalition. The Tell-el-Amarna tablets mention not only Megiddo and Taanach but other towns in the region as well. The Taanach letters, found in Sellin's excavation of Tell Taanak, were written in the fifteenth century B.C.E. and reveal, among other things, that the population of the town and the surrounding villages was to a large extent Hurrian.

Concerning the conquest of the district by the children of Israel we learn from *Judges* i: 27:

"Neither did Manasseh drive out the inhabitants of Beth-Shean and her daughter-cities, nor Taanach and her daughter-cities, nor of Dor and her daughter-cities, nor the inhabitants of Ibleam and her daughter-cities nor the inhabitants of Megiddo and her daughter-cities but the Canaanites would dwell in that land."

Thus the Israelites did not assume effective control over these cities. On the other hand, it is very difficult to decide to which tribe these cities were allocated. The statement (*Jos.* xvii: ii) that

"Manasseh had in Issachar and in Asher Beth-Shean and her daughter-cities, and Ibleam and her daughter-cities, and the inhabitants of Dor and her daughter-cities and the inhabitants of En-Dor and her daughter-cities, and the inhabitants of Taanach and her daughter-cities, and the inhabitants of Megiddo and her daughter-cities, even these countries."

does not enlighten us, whether Manasseh had extra-territorial property in Issachar and Asher. We do not know whether we are dealing here with purely formal claims or with a legal institution of extra-tribal property, the details of which have not come down to us.

Further material relating to the problem of the border between the tribes of Manasseh and Issachar is found in the Chronicler's account of the cities of the Levites:

"And out of the tribe of Issachar Kedesh and her suburbs, Daberath with her suburbs and Ramoth with her suburbs, and Anem with her suburbs." (*I Chr.* vi: 57-58.)

The parallel in the book of Joshua has:

"And out of the tribe of Issachar, Kishion with her suburbs, Daberath with her suburbs, Jarmuth with her suburbs, En-gannim with her suburbs; four cities."

The difficulty in reconciling these statements becomes obvious if we consider for instance the fact that the Book of Joshua states, in the last quoted passage, that En-gannim, the modern Jenin, belongs to Issachar. For in that case it becomes difficult to understand the statement, *ibid.* xvii:ii, according to which Ibleam belonged to Menasseh, for Ibleam was situated about a mile to the south of En-gannim, at the site of Khirbet Bal'ameh. Besides, the lists do not agree with each other: it may be that the original intention was Aner and not En-gannim. This Aner is mentioned in *I Ch.* vi: 55 as one of the cities of refuge near Bileam (which equals Ibleam). The city of Anem is generally identified with the site of Anin, a village near Um-el-Fahm. On the other hand, it may well be shortened spelling for En-gannim, giving just the beginning and the end of the

longer name. In the parallel passage in Joshua we find Taanach and Gat Rimon instead. This seems to reflect a tendency of its composer to substitute little-known names by well-known ones.¹

It would appear from all this that the border between Manasseh and Issachar was not continuous but was sown with extra-territorial "islands." Only with the victory of Deborah-Barak did Israelite rule in the district become effective.

When Solomon effected his new administrative division of the country into twelve districts, he gave to Baanah, the son of Ahilud, the fifth district:

"Baanah the son of Ahilud to him pertained Taanach and Megiddo and all Beth-Shean, which is by Zartanah beneath Jezreel, from Beth Shean to Abel-meholah even unto the place that is beyond Jokneam." (*I Kings* iv: 12.)

After the fall of Samaria Megiddo became the capital of the Assyrian administrative unit "Megiddo," next to Samaria itself, Gilead and the district of Dor. The district changed hands many times after that, until it came under the rule of the VIth Legion in the time of Hadrian. The name "Legio" supplanted the older name Otnai for the little township right next to Megiddo. The Arab Lajjun is a development of this Latin word, parallel to the French Lyon. The central part of the valley of Jezreel came under the rule of the town of Legio, its southern borders were south of Taanach and Beth-Eqed (the "shearing house" of the English versions, *II Kings* x: 12, Bet Qad of today). The neighbouring district to the south was Sebaste (Samaria) and to the west Nabata. Beth-Shean lay to the east.

Turning from the general history of the district between Megiddo and Taanach to the history of some of its ancient sites, we have to consider first the only typical "Tell".

KADESH

About a mile to the east from the Lajjun-Jenin main road, opposite the modern Jewish settlement of Giv'ath 'Oz, a small hillock can be discerned. This is the artificial mound of Tel Abu Qudeis. Right next to the Tell are some springs and waterholes which served the ancient settlement for a water supply. A surface collection of potsherds shows that this spot had been settled during the Late Bronze period, Early Iron and especially Middle Iron. There are a great many sherds typical for the Late Iron (Persian) period.

¹ M. NOTH, *Das Buch Josua*, 1938, pp. 98-9.

Byzantine and Early Arab sherds are present too, as are Hellenistic and Roman remains. On the western part of the summit, some stone walls of a building can be discerned. It belongs to the Middle Iron period.

The name Qudeis indicates an ancient Kadesh. *Josh.* xii: 22 mentions amongst the thirty-one kings who were subdued, "the king of Kadesh." He appears in a series with the kings of Taanach, Megiddo, Jokneam and Dor, more specifically between the kings of Megiddo and Jokneam. We should expect the king of this city to have been mentioned between Taanach and Megiddo. This, however, is no reason to substitute Kishion for Kadesh (following the list of the Levite cities *I Chr.* vi). A Kadesh in this district appears to be suggested by the account of the battle of Deborah as well. Sisera escapes after his defeat to the tent of Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite. On Heber the Kenite we read in *Judges* iv: ii:

"Now Heber the Kenite which was of the children of Hobab, the father-in-law of Moses, had severed himself from the Kenites, and pitched his tent unto the plain of Zaanaim, which is by Kedesh." The word translated in the English versions by "plain" means really a large tree. The word transcribed Zaanaim carries the Masoretic asterisk and should be read בצענים instead of בצענים. The word derives from a root צען (*Accadian* *ṣānu*), which means "to pack." It appears once only in the Bible (*Is.* xxxiii: 20), where the simile is a tent which shall never be packed up. This root is related to the root טען, which has the same meaning. Now the place name Zaanaim is mentioned in the Bible as being near Kadesh in Naftali, in fact as a border town of that tribe. The derivation of the name makes it doubtful whether it stands for a particular locality at all. It may well be a common designation for an outstanding tree near which the nomads used to pack or unpack their beasts. As such it may have attached itself to more than one place. Thus it seems feasible to relate "Zaanaim which is by Kedesh" not only to Kedesh in Naftali but to Kedesh near Megiddo as well. In modern times, before the establishment of the State of Israel, the Beduins used to erect their black tents in this region. Already Garstang² and others saw that the whole course of events during the battle of Deborah is more easily understood if we assume the existence of a Kedesh nearer to Taanach and Megiddo than Kedesh of Naftali. Otherwise it is very hard to understand the flight of Sisera. He

² J. GARSTANG, *Joshua-Judges*, 1931, pp. 301, 390, 403.

could have found a refuge nearer and safer than the Kenite encampment near Kedesh of Naftali. Moore³ suggested that *Jud.* iv embodies two different traditions about two different battles: one is connected with Hazor, Jabin, Zebulun and Naftali, the other with Haroset Hagojim, Sisera and the tribes bordering on the valley of Jezreel. The connection between the traditions is established in the prose account by making Sisera the commander of Jabin's army and Jael the wife of Héber. The conflation of the two stories would account for the misunderstanding about Kedesh as well.

These considerations, together with the fact that the words translated "plain of Zaanaim" may be of a more general character, make it seem likely that Kedesh-Tel-Abu-Qudeis was the Kedesh of the battle of Deborah.

There may be another pointer towards this identification in the Song of Deborah itself:

"The river of Kishon swept them away, that ancient river, the river Kishon." (*Jud.* v: 21.)

The expression "ancient river" has long been a source of embarrassment in interpretation. No ancient legend about the river Kishon has come down to us which would justify the attribute. It is extremely doubtful whether we can explain the word קְרוֹמִים in its other sense: "eastern." However, some important ancient versions (Cod. Alexandrinus, Symmachus, Theodotion) have here קְרוֹשִׁים instead of קְרוֹמִים. This would point to the fact that the river at this stretch had received a name closely connected with the nearby town. It is a well-known fact of Palestinian geographical nomenclature that one and the same river assumes many names according to the towns or villages it passes in its course. Abel⁴ too, interprets the reading of the versions as evidence of a direct connection with the town of Kedesh-Tel-Abu-Qudeis. It should be pointed out that the connection between this district and the Kenites may be much older than the time of the Judges. In the Annals of Thutmose III we find the mention of a "brook of Qina"⁵ south of Megiddo, most likely Wadi Lejjun which enters the Kishon river.

GATH RIMMON

The Arab village of Rumaneh, which has to be identified with Gath Rimmon on grounds of similarity of names, is situated a little less

³ G. MOORE, *Judges* (I.C.C.), 1910, p. 116.

⁴ F. M. ABEL, *Géographie de la Palestine I*, 1938, p. 468.

⁵ J. B. PRITCHARD, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 1950, p. 236.

than a mile from ancient Taanach. This seemingly easy identification has its difficulty if we turn to the Bible for confirmation. Concerning the cities of refuge we read in *Josh.* xxi: 25.

"And out of the half tribe of Manasseh, Taanach with her suburbs, and Gath Rimmon with her suburbs; two cities."

As against this we find in *I Chr.* vi: 55:

"And out of the half tribe of Manasseh, Aner with her suburbs and Bileam with her suburbs . . ."

In both instances, Joshua and Chronicles, there precedes a verse mentioning another town named Gath Rimmon, belonging to the tribe of Dan (a Tell in the area of modern Ramath Gan). It is, therefore, possible that the second Gath Rimmon is a scribal error that got into the text under the influence of the first. Cod. Vaticanus and Peshitta do not have "Gath Rimmon" here. On the other hand we have the mention of a Gath Rimmon in this region in a much older document, the Tell-el-Amarna letters, in which a Gitirimina appears to be situated near the town of Gina (En-Gannim, Jenin of today). In the book of Zechariah we have the following interesting simile for the day of punishment:

"In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon."

(*Zech.* xii: ii.)

The mourning was for the death of King Josiah at the battle of Megiddo in 609 B.C.E. About the death of the king we read:

" . . . and he slew him at Megiddo, when he had seen him. And his servants carried him in a chariot dead from Megiddo, and brought him to Jerusalem." (*II Kings* xxiii: 29b-30a.)

The parallel verse in *Chr.*:

" . . . and the king said to his servants. Have me away, for I am sorely wounded. His servants therefore took him out of that chariot and put him in the second chariot that he had; and they brought him to Jerusalem, and he died . . . and all Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah . . . and all the singing men . . . spake of Josiah in their lamentations to this day, and made them an ordinance in Israel . . ." (*II Chr.* xxxv: 23b-25.)

The death of Josiah was a severe shock to the whole people and its reverberations could be felt a long time after. According to the tradition of the historical books of the Bible the mourning was held at Jerusalem. In the verse we quoted from Zechariah there seems to be an echo of mourning near the actual field of battle, at Gath Rimmon. The latter is about 6 miles from Megiddo on the Acre-Megiddo-Jerusalem road.

Mitchell⁶ regards the expression "mourning for Hadadrimmon" as a testimony of the existence of a very ancient myth, not unlike the "mourning for Tamuz." This theory is based on the fact that in the verse quoted from Zechariah the name appears composed with "Hadad." Hadad was a very ancient Semite god and both his name and personal names containing it are very common in the ancient east. The name in the form "Had" appears in the Taanach letters as well (Letter No. 9). The same form "Had" is also found in documents from Ugarit (Fourteenth Century B.C.E.) where it appears as an alternate name of Ba'1'. Naaman the "captain of the host of the king of Syria" narrates that his king worships Rimmon, another god well known in the ancient Semite world. The father of Ben-Hadad the first is called Tabrimmon, "Rimmon is good." It is hard to decide which was the original name of the town; the Tell-el-Amarna letters and the book of Joshua have Gath Rimmon. This name can be explained entirely on an agricultural basis as meaning: "Pomegrenade Press." It is curious, that the name composed of the names of the two Canaanite gods is used by Zechariah, the prophet from the time of the second temple.

ZEBUBAH

The Arab village of Zebubah is situated about a mile to the south-east of Tel-Abu-Qudeis. The ancient remains on the surface (sarcophagi, potsherds) are of the Roman period.⁸ However, the name is much older and appears on the Tell-el-Amarna tablets (Tablets 138/B ed. Conder). The name reminds us of Baal Zebub, god of Ekron. In spite of its being a Philistine town there can be no doubt that this god, like Dagon, was of Semitic origin. The fact that the literal translation of the name of the god of Ekron means "lord of the flies" has given rise to a good deal of speculation. In Greek mythology Zeus appears occasionally as "god of flies" in connection with his ability to protect from infectious disease. Baal Zebub of Ekron has not only been compared to Zeus in his function as Ζεύς Ἀπόμυτος or θεὸς Μύιαγρος but was even thought to have been imported, with certain changes, by the Philistines. However, there can be no doubt that the name Baal Zebub has been changed deliberately and derisively from the original Baal Zebul.

⁶ H. G. MITCHELL, *Zechariah (I.C.C.)*, 1912, p. 331.

⁷ C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Manual*, III, 1955. §20. 541, p. 258.

⁸ 237. 1948, יפרם, אנציקלופדיה ארץ ישראל 1.

In the Greek text of the N.T. the name Beelzebub appears as Beelzebub. The zebul of this name can be traced to Ugaritic *z b l*-prince.⁹ Its meaning in Hebrew seems to have extended to "dominion, seat of rule." In Accadian its meaning is "to pay, or to receive, tribute." This connects directly with the meaning of the word in Ugaritic and the fact that the governor of Shechem was called Zebul (*Jud.* ix: 30) means perhaps that it was not so much a name as a title of a high official. Already E. Meyer suggested that the name of the tribe of Zebulun derives from the name of a person.¹⁰ Dussaud¹¹ points out that the name Zebulun appears in the Middle Egyptian Execration Texts (twenty-first century B.C.E.) as the name of a prince in Palestine, together with Shimeon.¹² The divine title "Baal Zebul" for which *Z e b u b*—"fly" or perhaps *Z e b e l*—"dung" was substituted by the anti-Baal party, should be compared to Baal Maon, which has the similar meaning "Baal of the seat of rule." This Baal appears in the name of the Moabite city of Beth Baal Maon (*Josh.* xiii: 17) (Mesha Stone, line 30). There is, then, strong evidence that Zebulah was the original form of the name of the city. Perhaps we may venture the guess that its original meaning was connected with the payment of tribute: Zebulah may have been the seat of administration of a district. That there has been a long tradition of tribute paying in the region is attested by the blessing of Jacob:

"Issachar is a strong ass couching down between two burdens: and he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear and became a servant unto tribute." (*Gen.* xlix: 14-15.)

All this, of course, does not explain the form Zebubah in the Tell-el-Amarna letters. Besides, due weight should be attached to the occurrence, in an Ugaritic text, of "*il d b b*" (*Anat* iii: 43) in a phrase which may be translated: I destroyed the house (or: the daughter) of the god Zbb.¹³

There are other problems concerning the geography of the district in Biblical times which still remain unsolved. E.g. the Arab village of Salim undoubtedly bears a Hebrew name. With which Shalem should it be identified? Together with two other places of the same

⁹ C. H. GORDON, *op. cit.*, §20.594, p. 261.

¹⁰ E. MEYER, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 1906, p. 538.

¹¹ R. DUSSAUD, *Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra et l'Ancient Testament*, 1941, p. 163.

¹² PRITCHARD, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

¹³ C. H. GORDON, *op. cit.* §20.523, p. 257.

name, one near Beth-Shean and the other near Nablus (Shechem), it should be taken into consideration when looking for the site of the Shalem which is mentioned in the book of Judith. In this connection it will be remembered that Guerin¹⁴ reported that he had seen remains of ancient buildings of the northern slope of the hill on which the village stands.

Mishmar Ha-Emek, Israel.

RAPHAEL GIVEON

¹⁴ M. V. GUERIN, *Description Géographique, Historique et Archéologique de a Palestine*, II, 1875, p. 230.

“Sanctuary” as a Metaphor for Scripture

WITHOUT any doubt, one of the most puzzling passages in the so-called Zadokite Fragments is “the extraordinary piece of exegesis”¹ of *Am. v*, 26-27 which has tantalized the commentators and has so far defied a satisfactory explanation. It would lead us too far were we to list the several attempts made since the publication of the Fragments nearly five decades ago at lifting the veil of obscurity enwrapping this strange passage. Nor would it serve any useful purpose to enumerate the adjectives used by various scholars to qualify this piece of biblical exegesis. Suffice it to refer to A. Büchler² who outrightly pronounced it “foolish and without the remotest parallel even in the freest rabbinic Haggadah.” It is not the object of this paper to deal with the entire passage, but merely to shed an illuminating light on one point: the interpretation of “Sikkuth your king” as referring to the Books of the Law. As will be seen, the idea which is at the bottom of the interpretation is neither “foolish,” nor “extraordinary,” nor “without parallel”; it can be detected in Karaite as well as in medieval Hebrew literature. Moreover, some oriental Jews today still call the Bible by a name which reflects the same idea underlying the interpretation in question.

The relevant passage reads as follows (vii: 14-16):

“... as He hath said: ‘And I will exile Sikkuth your king’...

The Books of the Law are the tabernacle of the King, as He hath said (*Am. ix*: 11): ‘And I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen.’”

What is immediately manifest is that the sectarian expositor took the word סִכּוּת in the meaning of מִדְבָּר. In this he is not alone; the same meaning we find in the LXX, Symmachus, Peshitta and Vulgate. The question as to whether the ancient versions actually had the reading *sukkath*, or whether the rendering “tabernacle” is to be considered merely as an exegetical (or midrashic) interpretation of *sikkuth*, need not detain us here. As regards the Fragments, the latter alternative appears to be correct,³ as our present text explicitly cites the reading *sikkuth*. Be that as it may, the expositor’s

¹ R. H. CHARLES, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.*, p. 816.

² See his review of S. SCHECHTER’s edition of the Zadokite Fragments in *JQR*, N.S. iii, 1912-13, p. 457.

³ Against MORGENSTERN, *HUCA* xvii, 1942-43, p. 262, note 185a.

own exegetical contribution consists in equating "tabernacle" with "the Books of the Law." As support he invokes *Am.* ix: 11: "And I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen." Evidently, in this verse, too, he must have equated "tabernacle" with "the Books of the Law"; otherwise, he could not have cited it as proof-text.

What is now the basis of this puzzling equation?⁴

The first step towards an understanding of the passage is to recognise that the word סוכה is not to be taken in its ordinary meaning of "hut," "booth," but in its connotation of "sanctuary," "temple."⁵ The passage then rests on the equation:

Sanctuary=Books of the Law,

and our task is to demonstrate the aptness of the equation and its occurrence in other sources.

To begin with, the description of the Books of the Torah as "Sanctuary" is a fine poetic comparison, a metaphor embodying a grand concept. It is based on the close analogy existing between the two and is expressive of the supreme importance and centrality of the Torah; it conveys in a single but striking phrase Scripture's transcending significance and sanctity: the Book of Books is the Holy of Holies.

Numerous points of resemblance suggest themselves. Without attempting to exhaust these, a few may be indicated here; more will be found as we proceed. The Sanctuary is the most sacred place; the Torah the most sacred book. The former is the abode of the Divine Glory; the latter the depository of the divine message. God reveals Himself in the Sanctuary; the Torah is a record of the divine revelation. If the divine voice is heard in the former, God speaks from the pages of the latter. The Sanctuary is the unifying centre, the Torah the unifying bond, of the nation.

This analogical description of Scripture is found in *Diqduqe*

⁴ At least one attempt at explaining the above equation may be noted here—namely, that of L. GINZBERG (*Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte, MGWJ*, 1912, p. 47), who suggested that the expositor connected the word סכות with the verb חסכה, "to listen," i.e. the Torah to which we are bound to listen.

⁵ Cf. *Lam.* ii: 6 (see Targum), *Pss.* xxvii: 5 (cf. Rashi in the name of Seder Olam) and lxxvi: 3 (see Targum). The interpretation of *sukkath David* as referring to the Temple underlies Qallir's *Qerovah* for the second day of the Feast of Tabernacles (according to the Ashkenazic ritual), beginning אורי סוכת דוד הנפילה. Cf. also *Pes. R.* (ed. M. FRIEDMANN), p. 138b. Notwithstanding the fact that the Temple was built by Solomon, it was nevertheless called "the House of David," see *MEKHILTA* on *Ex.* xv: 1 (ed. HOROVITZ-RABIN, p. 116); *Midrash Tehillim* (ed. S. BUBER), pp. 234, 309; *Pes. R.*, p. 7a.

Ha-Ta'amim by the Tiberian Massorete, Aaron Ben-Asher. He draws a parallel between the three divisions of the Bible and those of the Sanctuary⁶:

Pentateuch	=	The Holy of Holies
Prophets	=	The Holy Place
Hagiographa	=	The Courtyard. ⁷

The general idea, the comparison of Scripture to the Sanctuary, seems here to be presupposed. Ben-Asher's own contribution to it

⁶ Cf. *Diqduqe Ha-Ta'amim*, ed. S. BAER and H. L. STRACK, Leipzig, 1879, p. 2: כלם (נוסח אחר : הם) שבים לסדר הזה בבית קדש הקדשים והקדש וחצר אהל סוער, והמשכילים יבינו. Paragraph 3 (headed: *seder ha-miqra*), from which this quotation is derived, appears also in the Cairo Codex of the Prophets (895 C.E.) written by MOSES BEN-ASHER. BAER-STRACK (*op. cit.*, p. xvi), B. KLAR (*Tarbiz* xv, 1943, p. 172) and PAUL KAHLE (*JJS.*, 1956, p. 136) think that the paragraph was composed by MOSES BEN-ASHER himself.

⁷ The construction put upon this sentence (see preceding note) by B. KLAR (*ibid.*) cannot be sustained. According to him, what Ben-Asher is saying here is that the "order," i.e. the manner in which the Bible is written and everything pertaining to the biblical text goes back to the Torah scrolls that were kept in the Tabernacle and in the Temple. This interpretation does violence to the wording of the text. The three distinct terms: "Holy of Holies," "the Holy Place" and "the Courtyard of the Tent-of-Meeting," which unmistakably refer to the threefold division of the Sanctuary, are made by KLAR to mean: *Tabernacle and Temple*. This is done by taking the two separate terms "Holy of Holies" and "the Holy Place" as merely denoting "Temple," and "Tabernacle" is obtained by simply ignoring the word "courtyard." But apart from all this, "scrolls of the Torah" are not mentioned in the sentence at all. KLAR felt this difficulty and tried to supply the vital word by proposing a novel meaning of the word סדר, viz.: "Torah-scroll." He contends that the word is used in this meaning by RABBENU TAM in *Tosaphoth Men.* 32b, s.v. והאידנא. This is based on a misunderstanding. RABBENU TAM employs the word *siddur* in its usual meaning of "prayer-book." Ancient prayer-books contained chapters dealing not only with the rules relating to the writing of *tephillin*, *mezuzah*, bill of divorce, &c., but included also, often comprehensive, sections treating of the regulations governing the preparation and writing of the *Sefer Torah*. Cf., for example, MAHZOR VITRY which incorporated the whole of *Massekhet Sofrim* and also extensive sections dealing with massoretic matter (pp. 615-717). In fact, RABBENU TAM's rules concerning *pethulah* and *sethumah*, mentioned by Tosaphoth, are to be found there on p. 658. KLAR felt compelled to depart from the obvious sense of the sentence chiefly because he saw in the comparison of the three parts of the Bible with the divisions of the Temple a contradiction to BEN-ASHER's own view about the equality of all parts of Scripture. The contradiction is only apparent. Although Karaite ideology extended the scriptural basis for derivation of laws to include the extra-pentateuchal books, the Pentateuch continued to hold its foremost position as the principle source of the law, be it only by virtue of the overwhelmingly larger number of precepts derived from it. (It may be mentioned that according to Abū al-Surri [=Sahl ben Maš'iah] the number of precepts, positive and negative, in the Pentateuch amounts to 2,682 [?]; MS. British Museum, Or. 2498, fol. 160b.) The prophetic writings, although accorded an equally authoritative status, were explicitly designated by BEN-ASHER as "supplement to the Torah," thus clearly indicating their secondary position.

Instead of כלם, found only in one MS., read: הם, as attested by all other sources (cf. *Diqduqe Ha-Ta'amim*, p. 2, note 9). "They" alludes to the three parts of Scripture dealt with in paragraph 3. This removes the other difficulty raised by KLAR.

consists in pointing out two aspects of this comparison: the correspondence between the two in respect of (a) the tripartite division, and (b) the varying degrees of holiness attaching to the different parts of the two members of the comparison.

The idea as such must have been prevalent in Karaite quarters; we meet it again in a polemical epistle by Sahl ben Maṣṣiah. He interprets allegorically "the shepherds' tabernacles" in *Cant. i: 8* as signifying "the Books of the Prophets"⁸: "*And feed thy kids on the shepherds' Tabernacles*. The "shepherds" are the true shepherds⁹ who tended them with truth and compassion.¹⁰ These are the prophets who spoke from the mouth of God,¹¹ and the priests and judges who acted in accordance with the Torah. The *shepherds' tabernacles* are their prophetic Books that are transmitted by tradition together with the Torah in the hand of Israel". Underlying this interpretation is the idea that "tabernacle" is a metaphor for Scripture.

Again, a slightly different interpretation of the verse just cited is recorded by the Karaite Jacob ben Reuben in his compilation *Sefer Ha-'Osher*.¹² "Tabernacles" stands, according to this interpretation, for the Pentateuch. This coincides exactly with the Zadokite Fragments where "tabernacle" is likewise interpreted in reference to the Pentateuch.

From the examples thus far adduced we learn, then, that "tabernacle" (or "temple") figures as a metaphor for the Bible and its parts; either for the Pentateuch (Zadokite Fragments, *Sefer Ha-'Osher*), or the Prophets (Sahl ben Maṣṣiah), or the entire Bible (Ben-Asher).

Turning to rabbinic literature, we note first Abraham Ibn Ezra using the word "Sanctuary" as a metaphor for the entire Scripture, beautifully describing the Massoretes as "guardians of the walls of the Sanctuary." In the introduction to his book *Moznayim* he writes about them as follows¹³: "The guardians of the walls of the

⁸ Cf. S. PINSKER, *Liqqute Qadmoniyyoth* II, p. 34.

⁹ In contrast to the leaders of rabbinic Judaism who are commonly designated as "the shepherds of the Galuth."

¹⁰ Unlike the "shepherds of the Galuth" who oppressed and economically exploited the "flock."

¹¹ Not like the rabbis who fabricated the oral Law.

¹² Edited by ABRAHAM FIRKOWICZ under the title *Mivhar Yesharim*, Eupatoria 1836.

¹³ Ed. Venice, 1546, p. 196: שומרי חומות המקדש המעון מוסד ירי אלהינו אשר לא יבול זר להחריבו. וזה המקדש הם ספרי הקדש

Sanctuary-Fortress, founded by the hands of our God,¹⁴ which no stranger was ever able to destroy. By 'Sanctuary' the Holy Scriptures are meant." This passage includes both a point of resemblance and a point of difference. The resemblance: Sanctuary and Bible alike are divine creations. And the difference: the indestructibility of the Bible-Sanctuary. Continuing the figurative nomenclature, he says:¹⁵ "They (the Massorettes) counted the people [i.e. the words] of the Sanctuary, consisting of from two to eleven [letters]¹⁶ in order to prevent a stranger¹⁷ from approaching the gates of righteousness."

The man who elaborated at considerable length on the metaphor under discussion, and upon whom subsequent scholars have repeatedly drawn,¹⁸ is the celebrated grammarian and polemical writer against Christianity, Profiat Duran (known by the pen-name 'Efodi; 1360-1412). He places much emphasis on the fact of Scripture bearing the epithet "Sanctuary of God"—an epithet indicative of its unique status and overriding importance—and uses it as a means to urge upon his contemporaries the duty of studying the Bible which, he bitterly complains, was neglected in his time in favour of the dialectic study of the Talmud.¹⁹ In comparing the Bible to the Sanctuary he says, in effect, that just as the latter was the cause for the Divine Presence, *Shekhinah*, abiding in the midst of the people, so the reading from, and research in this sacred Book is rewarded by the providential care of God being vouchsafed to the nation. And as the sacrificial service in the Sanctuary effected forgiveness of sin, so the occupation with the Bible procures atonement.²⁰ Duran contends that the bloody persecutions of Spanish Jewry in 1391, which resulted in the massacre of entire Jewish communities and wholesale conversions, of which he himself was one of the victims (having been forced to feign Christianity for some time), was a divine punishment for the abandonment of the study of

¹⁴ These words are parallel to what is said about the physical Sanctuary (*Ex. xv: 17*): "The sanctuary, O Lord, which Thy hands have established." The verse is explicitly applied to the Bible by PROFAT DURAN (see further on). As to the idea itself that the Bible in its entirety is of divine origin, cf. LUDWIG BLAU, *Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, Budapest, 1894, p. 14.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*: ויספרו מתי המקדש מבין שתיים עד אחת עשרה למען לא יקרב זר אל שערי צדק.

¹⁶ There are three words in the Bible consisting of eleven letters: *Ez. xvi:47*; *xx: 44*; *Esth. ix: 3*.

¹⁷ Cf. *Num. xviii: 7*.

¹⁸ See note 22.

¹⁹ Cf. *Ma'aseh 'Efod*, ed. J. FRIEDLAENDER and J. KOHN, Vienna, 1865, p. 14.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

the Bible by the Jews of Spain. And again he compares the Bible with the Sanctuary saying that as in biblical times disaster befell the nation because "they shut up the doors of the porch, and put out the lamps, and did not burn incense, nor offered burnt-offerings in the holy place" (*II Chr.* xxix: 7-8), so the disaster of the Jews in Spain was due to the closing of the "doors" of the sacred Book, which is a Divine Sanctuary established by His own hands, and extinguishing its light. That the same tragic fate befell the Jews of France and Germany earlier than their co-religionists in Spain, this, he maintains, was because the former had forsaken the study of the Bible earlier than the latter. And if, on the other hand, the Jewish communities in Aragon escaped destruction, the reason was to be found in their custom of rising early in the morning to recite Psalms and supplicatory compositions made up of biblical phrases.²¹

Most important to our subject is Duran's statement: "In view of the many affinities between Holy Scripture and the Sanctuary it was a felicitous idea on the part of those who named this great Book *מִקְדָּשׁ יְהוָה*, the Sanctuary of God; it is truly a Sanctuary of the Lord, 'established by His own hands' " (cf. *Ex.* xv: 17).²²

He further states that it was because of the many characteristics common to both that the Bible was divided into three parts, corresponding to the three divisions of the Sanctuary.²³ This re-echoes Ben-Asher's opinion cited above and goes beyond it in claiming that the very division of Scripture into three sections was *originally* made in imitation of the same division of the Temple.

It is significant that Profiat Duran too, like the author of the

²¹ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 14.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 11 f: ומפני הענינים האלה בלם המיב מי שקרא הספר הזה מקדש כי הוא באמת מקדש ה' כוננו ידיו . . . This passage has been quoted by a number of scholars. To those listed by the editors (*op. cit.*, p. 14 of the Introduction) add DON ISAAC ABARBANEL in the introduction to his commentary on the First Prophets.

It should be noted that the title *מִקְדָּשׁ יְהוָה* given by ADOLPH JELLINEK to his edition (Vienna, 1874) of Yedidya Solomon Norzi's introduction to his massoretic commentary on the Bible (printed under the name *מִנְחַת שִׁי*, but called by Norzi himself *גִּיּוֹר פִּי*) is based on a misunderstanding of the colophon which reads as follows: "וְתִשְׁלַם כָּל הַמְּלָאכָה מִלֵּאכַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה שְׁלֹמֹה בְּבֵית ה' כִּי נִקְרָא הַסֵּפֶר: הַקֹּדֶשׁ הַזֶּה *מִקְדָּשׁ יְהוָה* כְּמוֹ שֶׁכָּתַבְתִּי בִּפְתִּיחַת רִאשׁוֹנָה בְּחֵדֶשׁ גִּיסָן שְׁנַת וּבְרִית שְׁלֹמֹה לֹא תִמוּט אֲמַר מִרְחֶמֶךָ. JELLINEK thought that the words "this holy book is called *Miqdashyah*" referred to Norzi's work. In fact, they refer to the Bible. Solomon Norzi made use of *I Kings* vii: 51: "and all the work that Solomon wrought in the House of the Lord was finished" to refer to the completion of his own work on the Bible, and in justification of the usage "House of the Lord" in respect of the Bible, he says that the latter has been called "the Sanctuary of the Lord."

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

Zadokite Fragments, Sahl ben Maṣṣliaḥ and *Sefer Ha-'Osher*, made use of the figurative designation of the Bible as "Sanctuary" for exegetical purposes. He interpreted the plural, "sanctuaries of God" (מקדשי אל) in the psalm-verse (lxxiii: 17): *Until I entered into the sanctuaries of God, and considered their end*, as referring to the two sanctuaries: Temple and Bible.²⁴ A variation of this interpretation is given (whether under the influence of Duran or independently, cannot be determined) by the Italian exegete, Obadia Sforzo (1475-1550), who explained "sanctuaries" as denoting Holy Scriptures.

To return to Duran's statement that the Bible was designated by the name מקדשיה. This is of special significance; it shows that the analogy here discussed was more than a mere poetic figure of speech which remained confined to literature: it found expression in the popular nomenclature of the Bible. Duran's piece of information may be illustrated and supplemented by the colophon of a Spanish manuscript of the whole Bible in the famous Sassoon collection. The manuscript, we are told, "is profusely illuminated in a most beautiful Moorish style from beginning to end."²⁵ The colophon reads:

אני אלישע ברבי אברהם בר' בבנישתי ברבי אלישע המכונה קרשקש
 יחז"ו השלמתי זה הספר של ארבעה ועשרים המכונה בפי ההמון מקדשיה
 וסיימתי יום רביעי שלשה עשר יום לחדש כסליו של שנת חמשת אלפים
 ומאה וארבעים ושלש לבריאת העולם והסימן קחו לי מנגן.

The importance of the colophon lies, first, in its being the oldest testimony to the name *Miqdashyah* as a title of the Bible.²⁶ The writer, Elisha Crescas, began to write it in 1366 and completed it in 1383—twenty years before the completion of Duran's work, *Ma'aseh 'Efod*, in 1403. Secondly, and this is of even greater significance, we learn from it that the name *Miqdashyah* was in vogue among "the common, untutored folk" (המון), whereas the "official" name, as it were, was "The Book of the Twenty-Four."

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁵ Cf. *Ohel David*, p. 13.

²⁶ The date of the Jerusalem Codex *Miqdashyah* (originally in possession of the Karaite synagogue in the Old City of Jerusalem, now in the Jewish National and University Library) is difficult to ascertain owing to the illegibility of the colophon at the decisive place, cf. the different readings of GOTTHEIL (with the help of DAVID YELLIN, *JQR*, 1905, p. 649) and I. BEN-ZVI (*Kiryath Sepher*, 1957, p. 367 f.). The former deciphered the date as: 1422, whereas according to the latter it is: 1322.

Unfortunately, no earlier information about this interesting title is at present available. The tenacity with which it maintained itself through the ages is evidenced by the remarkable fact, already hinted at, that *Miqdashyah* is still in use today among North African Jews—obviously brought with them centuries ago from Spain. In the course of time, however, not only was the conception forgotten upon which it was founded, but its very meaning was not understood any longer, and hence the word has been corrupted in pronunciation and spelling. In codex Ginsburg I²⁷ it appears in the form **מקדשייה** and in a book-list of the eighteenth century²⁸ it is written (three times): **מקדסייה**. The most corrupted form, however, is that heard by H. J. D. Azulay (HIDA) in North Africa: **מקשייה**.²⁹ This distorted form, it may be noted, appeared even in print as late as 1937—a fact to which the President of the State of Israel, I. Ben-Zvi, has recently drawn attention.³⁰

Finally, the interesting fact must be pointed out that the name *Miqdashyah* also penetrated Christian circles. It was employed by the Christian Hebraist, Sebastian Münster, as title of his Hebrew-Latin edition of the Bible, Basle, 1535. We may safely assume that he had at his disposal a Bible manuscript of Spanish origin bearing that title. The Hebrew text of the title-page, which furnishes a specimen of the Hebrew written by this distinguished humanist, may be reproduced here:

מִקְדָּשׁ יְיָ

עֲשֵׂרִים וָאַרְבַּע סְפָרֵי הַמִּכְתָּב הַקָּדוֹשׁ עִם עֲתִיקָתוֹ בְּלִשׁוֹן רוֹמִיִּים
וְעִם פִּירוּשׁ קָצֵר עַל פְּסוּקִים תַּמּוּרִים (!) וְקָשִׁים: נִדְפַס פֹּה בִּעִיר
בִּאֻזֶּל עַל יְדֵי ז'מ" בְּסִיעֵתָא דְשִׁמְיָא.

A slight but significant difference should not be overlooked. Sebastian Münster employs as component part of the title the *full* Divine name, the tetragrammaton, and not its abbreviated form **יה** as in *Miqdashyah*. No doubt, he did so with deliberate intention.

²⁷ Cf. CH. D. GINSBURG, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, London, 1885, p. 741.

²⁸ Cf. *Sassoon's Cat.*, p. 1017.

²⁹ Cf. his מורה באצבע No. 118: יזהר קרוא מקרא כל כ"ד תנ"ך חוזר הלילה והראשונים: היו קורין לכ"ד מקדשיה. ועדיין בערי המערב קורין לו מקשייה ושאלתי לחם מאי קשי"א ואין פוהר ואמרתי לחם שרצונם לומר מקדש ית ובפי התמון נשאר מקשייה

³⁰ Cf. *Kiryath Sepher*, 1957, p. 366.

Profiat Duran (whose grammatical work, *Ma'aseh 'Efod*, was studied and quoted by Christian scholars) attaches importance to the fact that the shortened and not the complete form of the Divine name is used, and explains that this was done in order to indicate that the Bible is only regarded as Sanctuary in the present exile—at a time when the Divine name and the Divine throne are incomplete.³¹ This, of course, does not apply to the Christian position, and hence the change to the full name.

We have seen that the comparison of Holy Scriptures with the Sanctuary is attestable in the Zadokite Fragments, Aaron b. Asher, Sahl b. Maṣliaḥ and *Sefer Ha-'Osher*. As far as the present writer is aware, the idea is not traceable in the talmudic-midrashic literature.³² On superficial consideration one might indeed be tempted to discover it in the "song of the kine," which the *aggadah* put into the mouths of the cows bringing back the ark captured by the Philistines into the Israelite camp (see *I Sam.* vi). The song runs, according to the current text³³ of *bTal. Ab. Zar.* 24b, as follows:

רוּנִי רוּנִי הַשִּׁטָּה
הַתְּנוּפְפִי בְּרוֹב הַדֶּרֶךְ
הַמְּחוֹשֶׁקֶת בְּרִיקָמִי זָהָב
הַמְּהוֹלָלָה בְּדַבֵּיר אֶרְמוֹן

According to Rashi, the word *devir* in the last line denotes "scroll of the Law" and the sense of the line is: the ark [=acacia] is extolled on account of the scroll of the Law it enshrines. Here then, one might say, we find the scroll of the Law metaphorically designated as *devir*, i.e. Holy of Holies. Little reflection is necessary to see that this is not so. Rashi did not take the word *devir* in the meaning of "Holy of Holies" and then as a metaphor for "scroll of

³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 12: ואמנם קראו מקדש יה ולא מקדש יי בשם בן ארבע אותיות לפי שהוא מקדש בגלות חוזה אשר כביכול שאין חשם שלם ואין חכמא שלם

³² The mnemonic in *bBaba Meṣ.* 86a, top (cf. D. OPPENHEIM, *Jüdische Zeitschr. f. Wissen. u. Leben*, 1875, p. 90) is without relation to the epithet under consideration. It is a purely formal *simman*, utterly unconnected with the meaning of the words. It is well known that such *simmanim* are frequently employed in the Talmud, cf., for instance, *Pes.* 114a where the words שמעוני אחי (I *Chr.* xxviii: 2) are used as *simman* for Isaac b. Aḥa שמעתא אהי.

³³ For parallels and *variae lectiones* see THEODOR's notes in his edition of *Bereshith Rabba*, pp. 581-82.

the Law," but considered it a Persian word signifying "book." The expression has thus no relation to our subject. As to Rashi's interpretation as such, it is based on the Amoraic statement (ibid.):

כמאן קרו פרסאי לספרא דביר מהכא ושם דביר לפנין קרית ספר (שופטים

11, א) which he (also Qimhi) understood to mean: What analogy is there for the Persians calling a *book* (*sifra*) "debir"? It has been pointed out,³⁴ however, that the Persian *debir* does not signify "book" but "scribe"; consequently, the word ספרא is not to be read as *sifra* but *saфра*, scribe. In reading *sifra*, Rashi was guided by the Massoretic text: "qiryath *sefer*"; it now turns out, however, that the Amoraic saying presupposes the reading "qiryath *sofer*"—a reading which also underlines the LXX and Peshittā.

If, then, we are right that the metaphor in question is not to be found in talmudic-midrashic literature,³⁵ we would again witness a significant point of contact between the Qumran sect and the Karaites. In the life and thought of these two sects Scripture occupied a predominant position, representing as it did the exclusive source of divine revelation and the sole object of study. "Sanctuary" was, therefore, a superb expression of this central position. It is perhaps not without significance that rabbinic writers who make mention of the metaphor "Sanctuary" are those whose literary pre-occupation was with the Bible, as commentators and grammarians and, like Profiat Duran, vigorously championed the cause of biblical study. Even Azulay mentions it in connection with and in support of his exhortation to read the Bible "again and again."³⁶

Through what channels and at what period the epithet *Miqdashyah* emerged among Spanish Jews—this question cannot be answered at present owing to the very scanty information at our disposal about the epithet mentioned. We recall that the earliest reference³⁷ to

³⁴ Cf. H. L. FLEISCHER in LEVY's *Neuheb. u. Chald. Wörterb.*, I, p. 433; A. KOHUT, *Aruch Completum*, s.v. and *Additamenta ad Lihrum Aruch Completum*, ed. S. KRAUSS, Vienna, 1937, pp. 136-37.

³⁵ Ibn Ezra, who also employs the metaphor, may well have derived it (like Profiat Duran) from Ben-Asher, or even from other Karaite sources. Notwithstanding his frequent polemics against Karaism, Ibn Ezra did not hesitate to borrow from Karaite authors, with or without acknowledgment. Later Karaite writers asserted that Ibn Ezra had been a disciple of Yefet b. 'Ali. If this is pure fiction, it contains nevertheless a kernel of truth in so far as it indicates Ibn Ezra's indebtedness to Karaite literature in general and Yefet b. 'Ali in particular (cf. PH. BIRNBAUM, *The Arabic Commentary of Yefet ben 'Ali the Karaite on the Book of Hosea*, Philadelphia, 1942, pp. xliii ff.).

³⁶ See note 29.

³⁷ Cf. note 26.

it is not prior to the fourteenth century. The fact, however, that it was only in vogue among the "common folk" seems to be of significance. It appears that "official," authoritative circles eschewed its use. Was it because they knew it to be of sectarian provenance? Or was it avoided out of fear that its use might give rise to a spiritualization of the Temple?³⁸

London.

N. WIEDER.

³⁸ Cf. I *Pet.* ii: 5; *Eph.* ii: 21-2, where the Temple is spiritualized, the Christian congregation being regarded as the real Temple.



Law and Equity in the Talmudic Concept of Sale

THE PURPOSE of the present study is to examine the relationship of Law and Equity in the Talmudic conception of Sale, with special reference to its possible application under modern conditions. The first Talmudical source which falls to be reviewed here is the second part of the Mishnah in *Baba Meši'a* 44a dealing with the sale of movables:

*If [A] drew into his possession [B's] produce without paying him the money, he cannot retract; if he paid him the money but did not draw the produce into his possession, he can withdraw. But they (the Sages) said: He who punished the generation of the Flood and the generation of the Dispersion, He will take vengeance of him who does not stand by his word.*¹

The contract of sale presents itself here as a Real Contract, i.e. the sale is concluded by the actual delivery of the object, or more precisely: by the vendee's taking actual possession of the object (drawing the object=*Meshikhah*). The drawing of the object constitutes a formal act of acquisition (*Qinyan Meshikhah*) and has two functions: it concludes the contract of sale and *uno passu* makes the ownership of the object pass to the vendee. Contract and conveyance appear to be inseparable in the Mishnaic conception of sale. It follows, therefore, that if the act of acquisition was not performed upon the agreement, then the agreement itself is voidable and either party may retract from it. The agreement would remain legally ineffective even if the vendee, acting upon it, paid the price. The Talmudic authorities, however, felt that retracting from an agreement, especially where the agreement is substantiated by an act, though not by the prescribed formal act, of acquisition, constitutes a serious breach of faith which must not go unpunished, and they have therefore instituted the *Din Mi She-para'*.

It will be argued below that the *Din Mi She-para'*, as well as the *Din Mehussar 'Amanah*, was meant to be an effective judicial sanction and owed its origin to the demands of equity in sale. The legal situation is, we suggest, as follows: according to *Halakhah* a

¹ This formula will henceforth be referred to as *Mi She-para'*.

contract of sale neither transfers ownership (*in rem*), nor does it create any obligations (*in personam*), unless it is completed by a formal act of acquisition (*qinyan*); this strict rule is, however, partially modified by the *Din Mi She-para'* insofar as obligations may well be created by an agreement, especially if substantiated by some act, e.g. payment of the price, while the strict general rule that no ownership passes without *qinyan* remains unaffected.

Let us now consider a *Baraita* (*Baba Meši'a* 48a) which deals with the same subject:

*Rabbi Simon said: "Though they (the Sages) ruled . . . the gold dinar acquires not the garment."*² *That is strictly the Halakhah; but they also said: "He who punished the generation of the Flood . . . He will exact punishment of him who does not stand by his word"; and he who concludes a verbal agreement does not acquire, yet he who retracts therefrom, the spirit of the Sages is displeased with him. Whereon Raba observed: we have no other [means] than that the spirit of the Sages is displeased with him. An agreement substantiated by payment of the price is subject to Mi She-para'; an agreement not substantiated thereby is not subject to Mi She-para'.*

Hence we infer that the sanction of *Mi She-para'* is reserved for the case where a contract of sale, though not concluded by an appropriate *Qinyan*, was substantiated by the payment of the price. The breach of a purely consensual contract of sale not followed up by any act is also condemned by the Tannaim, yet not subject to *Mi She-para'*. In an Amoraic controversy (*Baba Meši'a* 49a) the question of a purely consensual agreement comes up again but there it is treated in more definite terms, as follows:

A verbal agreement; Rab said, it does not involve Meḥussar 'Amanah (fidei laesio); R. Yoḥanan ruled that it does involve Meḥussar 'Amanah. The Halakhah follows R. Yoḥanan, that a simple verbal agreement involves Meḥussar 'Amanah.

Now, if *Meḥussar 'Amanah* were a mere moral admonition of a general nature like, for example, the maxim that "one must not speak one thing with the mouth and another with the heart," the *Poseqim* who discussed it would not have taken such pains to determine and restrict its application to certain well-defined circumstances. It is not without interest to note in this connection that the '*Arukh ha-Shulḥan* expressly distinguishes between *Din Meḥussar 'Amanah* and *Middat Ḥasidut*. Furthermore, it is significant that Maimonides,

² Meaning that the payment of the price does not include the sale.

Jacob b. Asher and Karo provided a place for the *Din Meḥussar 'Amanah* in the part of their codifications which deals with purely legal matters. The Talmudic original source of *Meḥussar 'Amanah* quoted above clearly regards *Meḥussar 'Amanah* as a legal institution, for obviously Rab cannot be taken to mean that there is nothing morally improper in breaking an agreement. Rather must Rab be understood to say that no judicial sanction—such as would be implied in the institution of *Meḥussar 'Amanah*—should be imposed against a breach of a simple agreement, while R. Yoḥanan held that a simple agreement should be protected by an effective measure. In view of the fact that the law was settled according to R. Yoḥanan, the *Din Meḥussar 'Amanah* must be regarded as an Amoraic institution analogous to, and progressively in line with, the Tannaitic institution of *Din Mi She-para'*. Both these institutions were introduced in response to the demand of equity for protection against breach of agreements, but while *Mi She-para'* originally protected agreements of sale substantiated by payment of the price,³ the institution of *Meḥussar 'Amanah* was to give protection to all agreements even if purely consensual. The question as to how *Mi She-para'* and *Meḥussar 'Amanah* actually protected a party to an agreement, is not of immediate importance here. *Mi She-para'*, we know, was meant to curse a defaulter and *Meḥussar 'Amanah* may well have been designed to reprimand him. Far more important is the consideration that the Talmud and the *Poseqim* take the institutions of *Mi She-para'* and *Meḥussar 'Amanah* seriously and endeavour to determine the scope of their application. Surely, this shows that these institutions were meant to be effective judicial measures and doubtlessly the courts understood how to use them effectively.

It is known, for instance, that such judgments used to be announced publicly, even in the synagogues⁴—an announcement, which would be tantamount today to an official publication of a judgment in a newspaper. In view of the fact that it is not customary at the present time to publish such judgments, except in cases of libel, and, furthermore, bearing in mind that it is more in accord with the general feeling of what is right that a breach of agreement shall be compensated for by the award of damages, it appears that nowadays

³ It will be seen later that the *Din Mi She-para'* was extended to agreements substantiated by acts other than the payment of the price, but never to purely consensual agreements.

⁴ See *Darke Mosheh* on *Ṭur Ḥoshen Mishpaṭ* 204.

a *Beth-Din* would be right in ordering a defaulter to pay damages as an appropriate and effective measure in the application of the *Din Mehussar 'Amanah*. "The general feeling of what is right" just alluded to we may term *Minhag ha-'Olam*, and the question arises whether the constitutional principles of Jewish Law allow the *Beth-Din* a progressive interpretation of a provision of the *Halakhah* such as we suggest? We shall revert to this question after reviewing a further Talmudical source, namely in *Baba Meši'a* 74a, which runs as follows:

*R. Papi said in Raba's name: the Siṭumta acquires. To what effect? R. Habiba said; to the effect of actual acquisition. The Rabbis said: to the effect of Mi She-para' . . . Where it is Minhag that it effects actual acquisition, it does so [with full legal force].*⁵

For the understanding of this passage, which originates from the late Amoraic period, let us recall that according to the Mishnaic rule discussed earlier a sale of movables is valid if completed by *Qinyan Meshikkah*. This form of *Qinyan* corresponds in fact to the *traditio* (delivery) of Roman Law. It is clear that a developed economy and expanding commerce needed easier forms of conveyance, and a way had to be found to conclude a legally valid sale without simultaneous delivery of the object. Mature Roman Law solved this problem by separating the element of contract from the element of conveyance in sale. A purely consensual agreement was sufficient to create an actionable obligation (*in personam*) between the *vendor* and the *emptor*. And yet, as regards conveyance (*in rem*) the rule persisted that ownership passes only by *traditio*. Some modern systems of law (German, Swiss) follow Roman Law even today. The Jewish law authorities, when faced with the same social-economic problem, i.e. creating easier ways of transactions, responded in a twofold way. On the one hand, the purely consensual agreement was given some protection (*Mi She-para'* and *Mehussar 'Amanah*) similar to the way of the Roman Law, but not as clear-cut. On the other hand, easy forms of conveyance were admitted; in fact, as we have seen from the above Talmudical passage, it was left to commercial usage to determine what is required in the way of conveyance. While Roman Law insisted as a rule on actual delivery in order to pass ownership, in Jewish Law an act symbolizing

⁵ R. Shelomoh Ben Adret derives from here the general rule of "Custom abrogates the law." See *Maggid Mishneh* on Maimonides' *Hilkhoth Mekhirah* 7, 7.

the transfer of property was sufficient for that purpose, provided that it was recognized by custom as a formal act of acquisition. Indeed, the Talmud mentions a great variety of such symbolic acts of acquisition. But let us attend now to the particular *Qinyan* dealt with in the above Talmudical passage.

R. Papi said in the name of Raba that *that* (האי) *Siṭumta* acquires. The expression האי סיטומתא indicates that the *Qinyan Siṭumta* was a well-known and widespread commercial usage.⁶ The word סיטומתא (in Alfazi: סתומתא) is Aramaic and means seal, stamp or mark. The word חותמת (signet) in *Genesis* xxxviii: 18 and 25, is translated in *Targum Onqelos* by עזקתא, while *Targum Yerushalmi* translates the same word by סיטומתא. In *Esther* viii: 8, the words "and seal it with the King's ring" are translated in the *Targum* וסטימו בעזקתא דסיטומתא דמלכא, and again in *Esther* viii: 10, "and sealed it with the King's ring" is translated in the *Targum* ואסתתם בעזקתא סיטומתא. It is clear that the word *Siṭumta* is derived from the root סטים which corresponds to the Hebrew root סתם as in *Genesis* xxvi: 15, סתמום פלשתים... הבארות אשר ("the wells which the Philistines stopped"). Thus *Siṭumta* would mean a seal, ring or a mark made by such a signet, or a mark or sign made on an object in any way. But *Siṭumta* may have an even wider meaning, especially if we rely on the Hebrew root סתם, i.e. stopping, finishing, closing (conclusion of a deal) in whatever way.⁷ The merchant custom of striking hand (*manus in manum*) to mark the conclusion of a transaction was sanctioned by R. Ḥananel as a *Qinyan Siṭumta*.⁸ Other *Poseqim* mention the *Arrha* (earnest), *traditio clavium* (handing over of a key) and other symbolic acts as particular forms of *Siṭumta*.⁹ Maimonides gave the *Siṭumta* a more restricted interpretation, saying that *Siṭumta* is the marking of an object by the purchaser indicating by this act that he has symbolically taken possession of the object, though actually the object was left for the time being in the hands of the seller.¹⁰ Rashi's interpretation of *Siṭumta* is the most restrictive. He says that *Siṭumta* is a custom in the wine trade. Retailers would buy several casks of wine and leave them in the store of the wholesaler, fetching the casks one by one as they were needed. At the time of the original purchase the casks which were

⁶ See *Derishah u-Perishah* on *Tur*, H.M. 204.

⁷ See *Derishah* on *Tur*, H.M. 204.

⁸ Quoted by Asheri on *Baba Meši'a* 74a.

⁹ See *Shulḥan 'Arukh*, H.M. 201.

¹⁰ *Hilkhoth Mekhirah* 7, 6-7.

left in the store of the wholesaler would be marked to indicate that they were sold. It has been suggested that Rashi had merely illustrated the meaning of *Siṭumta*, which may be very wide, by an example familiar to him, since he lived in a wine country and was himself engaged in the wine trade.¹¹ One must reckon, however, with the possibility that it was Rashi's intention to explain what *Siṭumta* had actually meant in Amoraic times.

Reverting for a moment to our philological discussion of *Siṭumta*, it seems to be clear beyond doubt that whatever interpretation of *Siṭumta* is adopted, the word itself is of Semitic origin. In view of this it is surprising that Benjamin Mussafja, an eminent Hebrew scholar of the seventeenth century, suggests that *Siṭumta* is of Greek origin, derived from the word σῦνθημα, which means sign or mark.¹² Mussafja's suggestion, surprising though it may seem, does not seek to alter the meaning of *Siṭumta*, since in its Semitic usage *Siṭumta* also means sign or mark. In dealing, then, with the legal meaning of *Siṭumta* we could ignore all philological controversies which do not affect the substance of its meaning. However, the suggestion that a Talmudical term is etymologically of foreign origin, has a bearing on the question whether the legal institution which is denoted by that foreign term might not itself be of foreign origin. It might be the case that when Mussafja suggested that *Siṭumta* was of Greek origin, he had at the back of his mind the idea that *Siṭumta* as a legal institution was of Graeco-Roman origin. There is the further possibility—we put it no higher than that—that Rashi may have been aware that *Siṭumta* was of Roman origin. This conjecture receives countenance from the following remarkable parallel in Roman Law.¹³

“Where a cask has been marked by a purchaser, Trebatius says that it is considered to have been delivered to him. Labeo, however, holds to the contrary.” Says Ulpian, “the opinion of the latter is correct, for it is customary to mark a cask in order that the wine may not be changed rather than consider that it is delivered at the time. However, the view of Paulus was accepted by Mediaeval Roman Law, namely . . .”

¹¹ See my “*Der Handschlag*,” 1954.

¹² See KOHUT, ‘*Arukh Completum*,’ s.v.

¹³ The following is a quotation from BOAZ COHEN, “*Traditio Clavium*” in *Studi in memoria di Paolo Koschaker, L'Europa e il Diritto Romano*, vol. II, p. 591. See also the sources indicated there. Cohen draws attention to this parallel in Roman and Jewish Law without referring, however, to Rashi and Mussafja.

There is thus a possibility that Roman Law influenced Talmudical Law—and not *vice versa*—since Trebatius and Labeo lived at the beginning of the Christian era and Paulus and Ulpian at the beginning of the third century, while our Talmudic passage originates from the fifth century. Without entering the general question how far Roman Law, or more exactly, Roman Provincial Law (which was a mixture of Roman, Greek and Oriental elements) influenced Talmudic Law, we venture to suggest that the *Din Mi She-para'* and *Mehussar 'Amanah*, which aimed at the protection of the consensual contract, were instituted under the influence of the Roman ideas of equity which produced in Roman Law the *emptio venditio* as a fully actionable consensual contract. Consensual contract never grew in Talmudic Law into fully actionable legal obligations perhaps because the dual character of the *Beth-Din* as a legal and religious authority adequately safeguarded the sanctity of agreements by means of *Din Mi She-para'* and *Mehussar 'Amanah*, which were in their nature a mixture of law, religion and morals. It may be of interest to note here that for many centuries after the collapse of the Roman empire it was left to the courts of bishops and archdeacons to protect the sanctity of agreements by the ecclesiastical punishment of *Fidei Laesio*. With the rise of the modern state and the decline of the power of the church, the protection of good faith became again a purpose of State Law. An analogous development in Jewish Law would mean that the sanctity of agreement would no longer be protected by religious sanctions, but by ordering the defaulter to pay damages for breach of contract.

It has been our endeavour to show that such a “modernisation” of Jewish Law can be effected without departing from the principle governing the Talmudic conception of sale, namely, אין המקח נגמר בדבריו. The meaning of this principle is that a sale cannot be concluded by words only, i.e. by simple agreement, or—to put it affirmatively—a sale can be concluded only by a formal act of conveyance (*Qinyan*). No departure is here suggested from the above rule of strict law; the rule is taken to mean, however, that an agreement cannot convey ownership, unless the agreement is completed by a formal act of conveyance. That this is the essence of the rule is clear from Maimonides' formulation אין המקח נקנה בדבריו (an object of sale is not *acquired* by verbal agreement).

We are aware that this rule originally also implied that no binding obligation shall be created by a simple agreement without *Qinyan*,

but this implication has been modified, and to some extent even abrogated, by the institution of *Mi She-para'* and *Meḥussar 'Amanah*. Even the evolution of the latter institutions into fully actionable legal obligations would be in accordance with the system governing the Talmudical law of sale, provided we do not allow ownership to pass without a formal act of conveyance. In this way the Jewish Law would adapt itself to the modern system of sale, as we find it in Swiss and German Law. But the system of Jewish law of sale can never adapt itself to the system represented by the English and French Law and the *Megela*,¹⁴ according to which the conclusion of a purely consensual contract of sale has the immediate effect of conveying ownership, since this would contravene the basic principle אין המקח נקנה בדברים.

The question now arises: How can the evolution of *Din Mi She-para'* and *Meḥussar 'Amanah* into a fully actionable legal obligation come about? Who has the authority to sanction such an evolution and under what conditions? From the point of view of its constitutional principles Jewish Law regards itself as of Divine origin and therefore in principle unalterable by man. The law has been fixed, as it were, once and forever, and no provision is made for a legislative power. Yet Jewish Law did not remain static, but has always tried to adapt itself to changing circumstances. The changes took place mostly by a process of slow and imperceptible evolution. There was, however, one powerful agent in this evolution, i.e. the *Minhag* (custom), to which the power of making and abrogating laws was conceded—מנהג מבטל הלכה. Now, *Minhag* has a very wide and varied meaning. It may mean the popular idea of right and wrong as crystallised in certain generally recognised demands on conduct. *Minhag* in this sense would be identical with Equity, and the expression *Minhag ha-'Olam* could also be understood in this sense. A never-ending debate goes on in jurisprudence whether custom becomes law by its own power or only after authoritative judicial confirmation. We can pose the same question in relation to custom in Jewish Law and the answer will be as uncertain as it is in jurisprudence in general, but this one may say with some probability of correctness: A *Minhag* is not created and established in a day: it needs time for its development. The law authorities as an important

¹⁴ *Megela* is Ottoman Law which remained in force in Palestine during the Mandate, while modern Turkey adopted Swiss Law. Strangely enough, the *Megela* is still in force in Israel.

part of the social set-up of a people may guide the development of a *Minhag* by furthering, retarding or even preventing its establishment. The judicial authorities keep a constant watch over the social life and by their judicial announcements adjust the legal conceptions of the people. This applies particularly to Jewish judges of old who were also the religious and moral teachers of the nation and widely participated in the general leadership of the community. In any case, it was never thought that a *Minhag* must automatically have the force of law. The law authorities assume a right to declare a *Minhag* to be a bad one (מנהג גרוע) and to resist its application. In this way the judicial authorities have an important share in the working of the *Minhag* as an agent of legal evolution. A closer study of the last-quoted Talmudic passage would indeed show that the Talmudic authorities tried to intervene in the working of the *Minhag Siṭumta*. This proves that the Rabbinic authorities did assume the power of deciding whether a *Minhag* was worthy of confirmation as a law or not. If, after all, the *Minhag* of *Siṭumta* was recognised in Law, this could come about only because it did not violate the basic principle of אין המקח נקנה בדברים.¹⁵

To sum up: The *Din Meḥussar 'Amanah*, in response to the demands of equity, condemns breach of agreement. To enforce the *Din Meḥussar 'Amanah* effective measures used to be taken by way of the public moral indictment of the defaulter, but changed circumstances rendered those traditional measures ineffective. There is general recognition, crystallized in the *Minhag ha-'Olam*, that the proper and effective measure against breach of agreement is the award of appropriate damages. There was no precedent in Jewish Law for awarding damages on the grounds of *Din Meḥussar 'Amanah* but the rule of מבטל הלכה מנהג implies the power and duty of the *Beth-Din* to modify the law in order to satisfy the demands of good *Minhag*. To give effect to the *Din Meḥussar 'Amanah* by committing the defaulter to pay damages does not abrogate the principle of the Talmudic law of sale which states, אין המקח נקנה בדברים. Hence this modern interpretation of the *Din Meḥussar 'Amanah* deserves to be confirmed by the competent Jewish law authorities.

The maintenance of the principle of אין המקח נקנה בדברים in the sense that no ownership may pass without an act of acquisition,

¹⁵ *Siṭumta* is more than "words"; it is an act; therefore the *Minhag* which transforms the act of *Siṭumta* into a formal *Qinyan* does not contravene the said basic principle.

coupled with the foregoing interpretation of the *Din Mehussar 'Amanah*, would bring the Talmudical law of sale into line with modern legal conceptions.¹⁶

Nairobi—Manchester.

A. EHRMAN.

¹⁶ That the problem discussed in the present article is of more than theoretical interest is shown by a judgment of the Rabbinic District Court of Tel-Aviv which was quashed, however, on appeal by the High (Rabbinic) Court of Appeals in Jerusalem (see *'Oseph Pisqe Din, Beth-Din ha-Gadol*, Jerusalem, 5710, pp.64-66).

The Arabic Dialect of the Jews of Baghdad and the Pronunciation of Hebrew

THE IMPORTANCE of dialects for the study of languages is well recognized today. There were periods when colloquial dialects were considered as faulty language. Nowadays, however, it is impossible to study a language without considering its various dialects.

A study of the particular Jewish dialects in different countries may at times have a double significance: it may contribute to the understanding of a given language, since many ancient and forgotten strata are frequently preserved in such a dialect. Frequently such dialects may even have preceded the written language itself. Secondly, a study of dialect may have a contribution to make to the Hebrew tongue, for many Hebrew words have become acclimatized and have entered the dialect, and an examination of such words frequently throws light on many dark and obscure alleys in the Hebrew language.

Students of Hebrew have already recognized the importance of such research which is being actively pursued in Israel today. They listen to the dialects of the various communities and observe their manner of reading Hebrew, and record them vocally. Not only students of language take part in this research, the wider aspects of which include cultural and social elements as well. Thus songs, folk-tales, legends and fables studied by historians, folk-lorists and musicians belong to this study. There is no more suitable place for research of this kind than in Israel. For there one finds the various dialects in close proximity. It is no exaggeration to say that every Jewish dialect in the world can today be heard spoken in Israel. However, there is a strong conviction that this material must be collected now. The children of the present inhabitants of Israel will not speak the same dialect, at any rate, not in the way their parents speak, nor are the prospects in the Diaspora any more promising, and more especially in the countries of the East, where the destruction of Jewish communities in our day has made the matter still more urgent.

As in the European countries, the Jews in Asia and Africa, especially in Arabic-speaking lands, have a dialect of their own, which varies from country to country. One of the ancient and important dialects amongst them is that of the Jews of Baghdad, which forms the subject of this paper.

"The Baghdadian Jewish dialect," or "the Baghdadian dialect," as I shall call it for short, means the Arabic dialect as spoken by the Jews of Baghdad and its surroundings. Although it is spoken also in other villages and cities of Iraq, I call it "Baghdadian" because Baghdad was the principal centre of Jewish life for many generations.¹ I cannot call it "Iraqi dialect" as Iraq includes also Jews who speak other dialects, for example the Aramaic-Kurdistani of the North.

Moreover, I wish to emphasize the word "spoken." The Baghdadian Jews have also a literature which includes stories, legends, songs (*pizmonim*), Halakhot and translations (the best known is the Passover *Haggadah*) written in the Hebrew Alphabet. But this is another dialect which varies almost entirely from the spoken one. My paper will deal with the dialect only as it is spoken by Jews naturally since their childhood, without any influence of the classical language or of other dialects. This dialect is basically Arabic, but one can see clearly the traces of Aramaic, Hebrew, Persian and Turkish.

Since my research is still in its infancy, I cannot offer here more than a discussion of the following points related to phonetics:

1. Concerning the consonants: the examination of the sounds *r* and *g* and their comparison with the Hebrew ר in ancient times.
2. Concerning the stress: the penultimate stress.
3. Concerning the vowels: the "glide" or the obscure vowels and the development of the vowels.²

I

The Pronunciation of ר³ ך

The problem of the pronunciation of the Hebrew letter ר in ancient times is well known.⁴ *Sefer Yeṣirah* (ch. 4) contains the following passage: שבע כפולות בג"ד כפר"ת ומתנהגות בשתי לשונות ב"ב ג"ג ד"ד (There are seven letters possessing a duplicate form, i.e. בג"ד כפר"ת, each having

¹ On the history of the Baghdadian Jews, see D. S. SASSOON, *A History of the Jews in Baghdad*, Letchworth, 1949; *idem*, *Massa' Bavel*, Jerusalem, 1955.

Continued at foot of next page

two sounds representing the hard and the soft, the strong and the weak.) In his commentary on *Sefer Yeširah*, Sa'adya Gaon points out that the Tiberians in their reading of the Bible, and the Babylonians in their speech, but not in their reading, pronounce the ׀ by two different sounds, and he tries to fix rules governing the use of each of these. In the case of the Tiberians he claims to have discovered such a rule. In the case of the Babylonians, however, he admits not having been successful.

Scholars have tried to solve this problem in many different ways, but it still remains obscure. One way surprisingly enough as yet untried is to examine how the Babylonian Jews of today pronounce the ׀.

In this section, I shall analyse the pronunciation of the ׀ in the Baghdadian Jewish dialect. Perhaps this analysis will make some contribution to the solution of the problem.

When examining the Baghdadian dialect, we see immediately that in it the Arabic consonant *r* is pronounced almost invariably like the consonant *ġ* without any difference. For example: *ra's* in classical Arabic > *ġa:s* in this dialect (a head); *'arāda* > *ġa:d* (he wanted).

But apart from this, the *r*-sound also exists in the dialect (although less frequently). Thus, e.g. *ġa'ri:da* (a newspaper); *qi'ta:r* (a train). Two sounds, however, are heard here, lingual and uvular: Alveolar-rolled sound, which here will be written *r*, and velar-uvular fricative, which here will be pointed *ġ*.

² The transcription of the sounds of the Baghdadian dialect in this article is as follows:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| č—as the consonant џ. | q—as in Arabic (voiced pharyngeal fricative). |
| č—as <i>ch</i> in <i>chair</i> . | q—as <i>th</i> in <i>the</i> . |
| g—as <i>g</i> in <i>go</i> . | ġ—as in Arabic (voiced velar fricative). |
| ġ—as in <i>judge</i> . | h—as in Arabic (breathed pharyngeal fricative). |
| q—as in Arabic (plosive uvular). | š—as in Arabic (a velarised s). |
| š—as <i>sh</i> in <i>ship</i> . | t—as in Arabic (a velarised t). |
| t—as <i>th</i> in <i>thin</i> . | x—as ʔ (without a Dagesh). |

The vowel *ü* indicates a central vowel which is pronounced approximately between the German *ö* and *ü* sounds, and sometimes as the French *e* (see section III). Long vowels are indicated by the sign (:). A stress is shown by a short vertical stroke (l) immediately before the beginning of the stressed syllable. Arabic and Hebrew words of the *written* languages are transliterated according to the rules of this periodical.

³ An article of mine concerning this subject has already been published in *Leshonenu*, Jerusalem, Vol. XX, 1956, pp. 47-49. Here I have attempted a more detailed analysis.

⁴ A bibliography on this problem is given in M. H. SEGAL, *Yesode ha-fonetiqa ha-'ivrit*, Jerusalem, 1928, pp. 30-33. A supplementary bibliography may be found in M. GOTTSTEIN's article in *Leshonenu*, Vol. XVI, 1948-49, pp. 209-211. Cf. also Y. G. P. GUMPERTZ, *Mivta'e sefatenu*, Jerusalem, 1953, pp. 113-125; Z. BEN-HAYYIM in *Qiryat Sefer*, Vol. XXX, pp. 168-170.

How did this situation arise?

A first hypothesis suggests that perhaps they are only different shades of the same sound; perhaps there are not two separate consonants which are capable, by substitution, of changing the meaning of the word, but there is one and the same consonant which varies according to its proximity to certain consonants and vowels. In other words: perhaps it is only a question of phonetic changes.

A closer examination refutes this conjecture. We find pairs of words which have the same consonants, vowels, duration and stress, and the only difference between them is that here we have the *r*-sound and there the *ġ*-sound, whilst they nevertheless differ in their meaning. For example:

faġġ=he poured, served (food), compared with *farr*=he threw.

'qaddaġ=he measured, compared with *'qaddar*=he estimated, valued.

'ġayyaġ=he dressed up, compared with *'ġayyar*=he changed.

'faġġaq=he separated, compared with *'farraq*=he distinguished.

In the same way:

'baġġa=outside, compared with *'barr*=a desert.

h'ġa:ġa=a stone, compared with *'haġar*=a precious stone.

A phonological examination shows us, however, that the sounds *r* and *ġ* are two different *phonemes*, and not two *allophones* or sub-phonemic variants of the same phoneme, independent of how we define the phoneme. These two sounds occur in the same phonetic context (according to the theory of Daniel Jones) and are also capable of distinguishing one word from another (if we follow Trubetzkoy and others).

Once again we ask therefore: how did this duplication arise?

The solution may be found by examining the problem, not from the *phonetic* aspect but from the *etymological* one. That is to say, by observing the words containing the sounds *ġ* and *r*, by investigating their sources, and by comparing them, we shall see if from this aspect there is any difference between the words containing an *r*-sound and the words containing a *ġ*-sound.⁵

In fact this demonstrates:

1. *The words containing a ġ-sound⁶ are, in general, Arabic.*

⁵ We speak here, of course, of words in which the *ġ*-sound has replaced the Arabic letter *r* or the Hebrew ר, etc. but not the Arabic letter *ġ*.

⁶ See the preceding remark.

e.g. 'gūḡūl (a leg); 'śahūḡ (a month); 'aḡūb'a (four)⁷; and many more like them.

2. *The words containing an r- sound are, in general, not Arabic.* e.g. Hebrew: 'to:ra < תורה; 'se:für < ספר (a scroll of Torah); ru'ha:ni < רוחני; 'eḷ'ro:g < אתרוג; 'he:rüm < חרם.

And also in proper names, e.g. 'abra'ha:m (אברהם), ru'be:n (ראובן), ha'ro:n (אהרן), 'üzra (עזרא).

Persian⁸: 'qu:ri (a teapot); ḡu'ra:b (a sock).

Turkish: 'kondra (a shoe) < kundara; 'süḡra (a jacket) < setre; 'ti:ra (a cotton thread) < tire; 'a:farim (bravo!) < aferim (or aferin) or perhaps from Persian.⁹

It is interesting to note that words which entered the Baghdadian dialect from other languages retained the r- sound; even though the root is Arabic (or is found in Arabic as well) and already is found in this dialect to contain the ḡ- sound. e.g. b'ra:xa (blessing), with an r- sound, from the Hebrew ברכה; but 'be:ḡak (he blessed) and all the conjugations of this verb are with a ḡ- sound, from the Arabic bāraka.¹⁰ Likewise: 'šarbat (syrup),¹¹ with r, from the Turkish şerbet (or perhaps from Persian), but 'šaḡab (he drank) etc.—with ḡ from the Arabic shariba.

3. *The few Arabic words containing an r- sound are, generally speaking, of recent origin, and gained entry in their native Arabic pronunciation either from the literary language or from one of the dialects or perhaps via some non-Arabic language such as Turkish or Persian.*¹²

⁷ In written Arabic: riḡl, shahr, 'arba'a.

⁸ Concerning Persian words containing the ḡ- sound see my above-mentioned article in *Leshonenu*, XX, p. 48, note 2.

⁹ When words exist in both Turkish and Persian, it is not easy to decide from which of them the words were borrowed by the dialect. It is not the original source of the word which interests us here but the question through which language it was borrowed. The lending language, although in it too the word is a borrowed one, is considered for the purpose of this research as the "original source." The investigation of Persian and Turkish words in this dialect is important for other reasons, but since in this particular subject the rule for the Turkish words applies also to the Persian words, it will make no difference which was the lending language. Thus if a certain word which has been pointed here as a "Persian" one will be proved afterwards to be a "Turkish" one (i.e. one that made its entry via Turkish) or *vice versa*, this will not have any effect on the ultimate conclusions.

¹⁰ One should note also this difference: b'ra:xa is pronounced with an x- sound as in Hebrew, but 'be:ḡak is pronounced with a k- sound as in Arabic.

¹¹ As is known, the word "syrup" also originated from the same Persian or Turkish word.

¹² It is also possible that some of them are originally not Arabic.

This can easily be proved:

(a) Terms for new inventions, e.g. *ǧa'ri:da* (a newspaper), *qi'ta:r* (a train), etc.¹³

(b) Words in which one of the consonants other than the *r*-sound testifies that they belong to one of the other Arabic dialects.¹⁴

(c) Sometimes an Arabic word (generally literary) entered the dialect at a later period with a particular meaning, although the very same word already existed in the dialect, but with a different meaning; and then the word in its new meaning was pronounced with an *r*-sound, like every borrowed word, but in its old meaning was pronounced with a *ǧ*-sound, like all the words forming part of the original stock of this dialect.

It seems possible to explain in this fashion the pairs of words mentioned earlier: *faǧǧ* (he poured food) compared with *farr* (he threw), *'qaddaǧ* (he measured) compared with *'qaddar* (he estimated), etc., although both of these go back to the same Arabic root. It does not seem that there was any special intention to distinguish these meanings by different pronunciations. For in that case we should have expected to hear an *r*-sound in words where the pronunciation of a *ǧ*-sound for the letter *r* would be apt to lead to confusion with the letter *ǧ* which is also pronounced *ǧ*; and there is no trace of this.

Thus a closer consideration of those pairs of words will show that, generally speaking, the meanings of words pronounced with a *ǧ*-sound are more frequent, more concrete, more "basic" and seem more "primary" compared with those pronounced with the *r*-sound. "To measure" (*'qaddaǧ*) is more concrete than "to estimate" (*'qaddar*), and the same is true of "to separate" (*'faǧǧaq*) compared with "to distinguish" (*'farraq*). "A stone" (*h'ǧa:ǧa*) is more frequent than "a precious stone" (*'haǧar*). Therefore the

¹³ Indeed, *ṭiy'ya:ǧa* (an aeroplane) is pronounced with a *ǧ*-sound and not with an *r*-sound, although it is a new invention. But since the root "*'ta:ǧ*" (to fly) has already existed in the dialect before, it seems that here an internal formation has taken place and not any borrowing from an outside language.

¹⁴ e.g. *'marag* (soup < *maraq* (in written Arabic)). The fact that this is pronounced *'marag* with a *g*-sound and not *'maraq* with a *q*-sound, although every Arabic *q* is pronounced in the Baghdadian dialect with a hard *q*-sound almost without exception, proves that this word has entered from a dialect in which the letter *q* is pronounced *g*.

'Darag (a drawer) < *dirǧ*. Here also we see another strange fact: the letter *ǧim* is pronounced *g* but not *ǧ* (and in the Baghdadian dialect every *ǧim* is pronounced *ǧ*). Hence this word entered from a dialect in which the *ǧim* was pronounced *g*.

words containing the *ġ*- sound give the impression even by their meaning of being older and original.¹⁵

From this we may conclude:

1. *The original sound of the Baghdadian dialect was ġ.*
2. *The r- sound entered with the foreign words, originating from other dialects and other languages.*
3. Since the *r*- sound did not exist in the dialect, and since the Hebrew words in the dialect are pronounced with the *r*- sound, it is possible to assume that *the pronunciation of the Hebrew ך in Babylonia, in the period when these Hebrew words entered the dialect, was r*. And thus, to this day, the Baghdadian Jews, in their readings of the Torah, pronounce the *r*- sound only.

The remarks of Sa'adya Gaon concerning the pronunciation of the ך by Babylonian Jews are now clear. According to him, there is a duplicate pronunciation of the ך in their speech only and not in their reading of the Bible. Indeed, in their reading of the Torah, and in their general use of Hebrew (and the Hebrew words in the dialect demonstrate this) the Baghdadians pronounce the *r*- sound only. In speech, however, in their Arabic dialect, they pronounce both the *r*- and *ġ*- sounds. Sa'adya tells us that he did not succeed in finding rules for the duplicate pronunciation of the ך by the Babylonians. The reason is simple—there is no *phonetic* change, for there are two *phonemes* here.

Perhaps in this direction we should seek also the solution of the problem of the duplicate pronunciation of the ך by the Tiberian Jews. Possibly, there also, two different phonemes existed, and there was no point in seeking rules. And the complicated rules of Sa'adya, which are difficult to explain from the phonetic point of view, have no solid foundation. But this problem is outside the framework of this paper.

II

The Stress

The problem of the stress in Hebrew is also well known. I mean here the problem of the place of the stress, whether it was mostly ultimate, as the *te'amim* of the Bible show, or whether penultimate,

¹⁵ "To change" (*ġayyar*) seems more "primary" than "to dress up" (*ġayyaġ*), which may, as it were, refute our assumption, but in this case the dialect has another word for "to change"—*'baddal* (which means also "to change clothes, to dress"), and it occurs more frequently in it than the word "*ġayyar*," which shows that the last mentioned is possibly a "foreign" word.

as one may conclude from various sources, and as is found in a few dialects such as Samaritan, Yemeni and Ashkenazi.

The Baghdadian dialect, with which we now deal, strengthens the second opinion. Its penultimate stress is heard not only in Arabic words but in Hebrew words as well. e.g. *s'o:da* < סעודה; *'sükka* < סוכה; *'mašša* < מצה; *y'hu:di* < יהודי. In names of festivals: *h'nükka* < חנוכה; *rüšša:na* < ראש השנה. And in proper names: *'le:wi* < לוי; *m'našši* < מנשה; *'üzra* < עזרא.¹⁶

Not only in their spoken Arabic nor just in the Hebrew words which entered their dialect but also in their reading of the Mishnah and the Talmud many words which according to the *te'amim* have the ultimate stress are given the penultimate stress by the Baghdadian Jews. e.g. נש'בְּרִי, נסת'פְּקִי, even in the middle of the sentence,¹⁷ and also in usual verb forms such as: אָמְרִי, הִלְכִי, etc. All this in spite of the fact that in reading the Bible the Baghdadian Jews take special care to read it according to the accentuation of the *te'amim* almost without exception.

Cannot one see here a confirmation of the hypothesis that there was another tradition of stress in reading and speaking which varied from the *te'amim* and was penultimate? The *te'amim* tried, as it were, to enforce a certain way of reading; yet as we see, they could not have completely dominated the language of the people outside the use of the Bible.

In the colloquial Hebrew of Israel today there are many words which are given the penultimate stress, although according to the "grammar" they ought to be given the ultimate stress, e.g. אִמְצַע, אִמְצָה, אִמְצָה, אִמְצָה. Why has this situation arisen?

Some scholars think that this has been done, consciously or unconsciously, with the intention of distinguishing between words similar in pronunciation but different in their meaning. Thus the stress of one of them was shifted to the former syllable. e.g. אִמְצַע as compared with אִמְצָה (in the "Israeli" speech there is no difference between ע and א); אִמְצָה as compared with אִמְצָה (for the *mappiq* is no longer discernible in speech); רִחְבּוֹת as a name of a place, compared with רִחְבּוֹת, the plural of רִחְבּ; שְׂרָה and רִבְקָה our friends compared with שְׂרָה and רִבְקָה our matriarchs, and so on.

¹⁶ Indeed this is not true of all names. Cf. *ru'be:n* (ראובן), *ko'he:n* (כהן) etc. which are stressed ultimately.

¹⁷ Such a phenomenon is found in various manuscripts and has been already pointed out by scholars.

The accentuation took upon itself, as it were, the task of distinguishing meanings. This is a fascinating hypothesis and is almost acceptable.

A closer examination, however, proves that this is not the case.

First of all, the stress as a distinguishing sign is already found in the Bible. The difference between קָמָה in the past tense as against קָמָה in the present, between בָּאתָ in the past tense as against בָּאתָ in the present is shown by accent only. How astonishing it is, therefore, that the spoken Hebrew of today in which, according to the above-mentioned hypothesis, the accentuation plays so important a rôle, and which, according to H. Rosen, "developed a new system of rules of accentuation"¹⁸ which might have preserved this distinction between past and present, does in this very instance obliterate it. The penultimate stress is used in all cases, whether past or present.

If, secondly, accentuation is indeed to serve as a distinguishing mark, one might have expected the reverse phenomenon as well, i.e. to find a pair of similar words with different meanings to be distinguished by the pronunciation of one of them with the ultimate stress. Why does this phenomenon not occur?

Thirdly, we have found words with the penultimate stress in modern Hebrew, although they have no parallels in words with the ultimate stress.

Hence it is obvious that it was not the desire to distinguish between the meanings of similar words which gave rise to the shifting of the stress to the penultimate but the general tendency to use the penultimate stress without the slightest thought of the possible result that this might produce. Of course, this shifting of stress sometimes distinguishes, e.g. between רַחוּבוֹת and רַחוּבוֹת, between בִּירָה and בִּירָה, and sometimes obliterates all distinction as, e.g. in קָמָה, בָּאתָ for both the past and the present tenses—but the tendency toward shifting of stress has no relationship whatsoever with semantics, neither in the distinguishing of meaning nor in the removal of all distinction. Whether this tendency is natural or not is a matter which requires examination. But it should be noted that the same tendency is found in the Baghdadian and in other dialects.¹⁹

¹⁸ H. Rosen, *Ha-'ivrit shellanu*, p. 82.

¹⁹ One may object that if this is a natural tendency, the majority of words in Hebrew today should not have retained the ultimate stress. One may also ask why just these particular words shifted their stress to the penultimate. Concerning these questions see my forthcoming article on the accentuation of the spoken Hebrew in *Leshonenu*.

III

Development of Vowels

One of the qualities which characterises the Baghdadian dialect is the sliding over of vowels: there are many consonants without clearly sounded vowels.

Thus we have an abundance of consonants without vowels, for example at the beginning of words as, e.g. in verbs in *fa'ala* conjugation: *k'tabtu* (I wrote), *k'tabt* (you wrote), etc.—In *tafā'ala*: *t'ha:rab* (he fought), *d'da:man*²⁰ (he became accustomed to).—In *'ifta'la* conjugation: *š'tağa* (he bought), *š'ta'al* (he burnt), etc.—In nouns: *d'ma:n* (habit), *f'la:n* (so and so), *n'ha:g* (a day), *š'ba:'a* (a finger), *d'fa:tüg* (exercise-books), *m'sa:hüf* (books), etc.—The same is found in Hebrew words, e.g. *s'o:da* < סעודה, *g'ma:ra* < גמרא, *b'ra:xa* < ברכה, *k'tübbä* < כתובה, *ħxa'mi:m* < חכמים, etc.

This phenomenon seems most natural: every word has one principal vowel, the vowel containing the accent. Is it not natural in fluent speech to reach this vowel by the shortest way and leave it equally quickly?

Every one who examines the vowels frequently comes across an obscure vowel, the exact nature of which he cannot decide. This is usually a very short central vowel almost without any clear identity (I point it here with the sign *ü* but in fact it is heard sometimes as an *i*-sound, sometimes as an *ə*-sound or other central vowels). For example: *mnül'be:t* (from the house). The truth of the matter is that what we hear in this case (i.e. the vowel *ü*) is not a voluntary vowel but only a sound which is involuntarily uttered as the natural and inevitable result of pronouncing two or more consonants one after the other without any vowel between them. This vowel is called a "glide" by the phoneticians. When is a glide heard and when is it not? This depends on both the consonants and the speaker. Some speakers can pronounce consonants one after the other without any vowel between them, and some cannot. Some consonants can be joined to each other without the help of a vowel and some cannot.

To repeat the example we mentioned above: "from the house" is in this dialect really (in my opinion): *mnü'l'be:t*. But if one tries to pronounce four consonants one after the other without any vowel (*mnülb*), one will not be able to do so. Against one's will one

²⁰ The initial unvoiced *t*-sound is heard here under the influence of the following voiced *d*-sound as a voiced *d*-sound.

will force some sort of vowel between them as, e.g. between the sounds *n* and *l* (*mnül'be:t*) or even between *m* and *n* (*münül'be:t*). Indeed if one listens carefully, one may sometimes hear the first, sometimes the second.

It would be interesting to examine which consonants in this living dialect can be produced one after the other without the need for an auxiliary or transitory sound and which cannot. Such research is important for explaining the development of the vowels in general.

I shall give here only a few examples from Hebrew.

In the case of the word שָׁלַחְתָּ, e.g. the third consonant of the root is vowelised by *pataḥ*, unlike the other verbs in this conjugation where the third root consonant has no vowel, e.g. קָתַבְתָּ הִלַּכְתָּ. The reason is that everyone who pronounces the ך as it has to be pronounced, i.e. by the pharynx, and tries to say *ša'laḥt* will, without intention, produce an assisting-vowel after the pharyngal *ḥ*. This assisting-vowel has been pointed with the sign *pataḥ* in the Bible. Today, for instance, when many people pronounce the ך as an *x*-sound there is no need for the assisting-vowel, and therefore it is no longer heard (*ša'laxt*).

We see the reverse process in the word יָלַדְתָּ. In the days when the ך had a soft sound, it was possible to pronounce it without a vowel, but today, in the spoken language, when ך has a hard sound, and there is no distinction whatsoever between ך and ךּ, it requires an assisting-vowel. Thus, in Israel today we frequently hear the form *ya'ladet*.

In the same way, scholars explain the development of the seggolate nouns. נֶעֱר is in fact נֶעַר. The seggolates are in fact the classical example of this theory; but this is well known, and there is no need to elaborate this point.

M. H. Segal, in *Yesode ha-fonetika ha-'ivrit*, examines the sonority of the Hebrew sounds and shows why, for example, the word נֶדַד has retained its form without an assisting-vowel, whereas the hypothetical form נֶדֶן changed to נֶדֶן. H. Rosen, in his book *Ha-'ivrit shellanu*, examines the sonority of Israeli Hebrew. It is clear, however, that neither research into Biblical language nor into the field of the Hebrew spoken today can be as accurate as one would desire. Research into Biblical language cannot be accurate because it is occupied with the signs of the written language, and

there is no written language which is capable of expressing every *nuance* and every possible inflexion of vowel. Research on spoken Hebrew cannot be accurate, as for most of those who speak it in Israel it is a second language, and they are perforce influenced by their original mother-tongues. Therefore the time is not yet ripe for speaking of natural Israeli characteristics.

This does not apply to the Baghdadian dialect with which we deal here. It is true that there too differences may occur between different individuals, families and towns. But it is a living dialect with a long-standing tradition, and it is possible to discern within it general trends and characteristics. Furthermore, these trends are likely to illuminate research into the Hebrew language also.

Of course, one cannot simply transfer all conclusions arrived at in the study of this dialect to the study of the Hebrew language. For, as in other linguistic problems, so in the question of sound formation one language varies from the other, one tribe cannot be compared with the other, and one period differs from the other. But the natural laws of this living language can help us to discover the natural laws of the language which has remained in writing alone. Indeed any living dialect can assist us in this way. How much more so this dialect which is close to Hebrew, influenced by Hebrew, and which was spoken for generations in a country which until recently was an important Jewish centre.

Leeds.

JACOB MANSOUR.

A Circle of Pneumatics in Pre-Hasidism

THE FOLLOWING note aims at analysing certain aspects of the life of "the circle of Naḥman of Kossov"¹ with a view to establishing its historical position between the late Sabbatian and early Hasidic movements. A scrutiny of a short passage in *Shibhey ha-Besht*,² the legendary biography of Israel Ba'alshem, about the circle enables us to make the following observations:

The circle is called *Habhurah Qadisha*, and its members *Benē Habhurah Qadisha* or *Anshē ha-Habhurah*. Naḥman of Kossov³

¹ B. DINABURG, "The Beginnings of Hasidism and its Social and Messianic Elements," (in Hebrew) *Šion*, Vol. IX (1944) pp. 186-7, (reprinted in his *Be-mifneh ha-Doroth*, 1955, pp. 159-161); G. SCHOLEM, *The Two first Testimonies on the Relations between Hasidic Groups and Ba'al Shem Tobh, Tarbiš*, Vol. XX (1950), p. 239.

² Ed. HORODETZKY, Berlin, 1922, pp. 56-57.

³ For his radical ideal of continuous contemplation (*debhequth*) and its technique cf. my article, "The Beginnings of Hasidism" (in Hebrew), *Šion*, Vol. XVI (1951), pp. 60-65. Being a wealthy tax-farmer he could afford to pay a weekly salary to a man to be on constant attendance on him when he was among people. The man's task was to remind him with a hint of the duty of uninterrupted contemplation, a duty which he performed in a fashion characteristic of Hasidic piety, even during social intercourse, cf. *Toledoth Jacob Joseph*, 1780, p. 186a. On being asked if it was possible to occupy oneself with religious contemplation while engaged in business, Naḥman is recorded to have replied that if it was possible to concentrate on business matters during prayer in the synagogue, the reverse should be possible too (*ibid.* 17b). Another example of the sardonic wit of this remarkable personality, directed against attacks on the new type of religiosity, is to be found in *Toldoth* 44a, *Shibhey* 57b.

The challenge of how to achieve *debhequth* during every-day occupations was one of the most vexed problems of early Hasidism, see G. SCHOLEM, *Devekuth, or Communion with God, The Review of Religion*, Vol. XV (1950), p. 115 ff. and my article in *Šion*, Vol. XVI (1951), p. 60 ff. I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to suggest here some likely literary sources for the Hasidic ideal of *debhequth* in the course of every-day affairs. It was certainly influenced by chapters 51 and 52 of Vol. III of *Moreh Nebhukhim* which describe the life of the Patriarchs and Moses in terms of continual *debhequth*, even while busy with profane tasks. The pre-occupation of Hasidim, living not later than in the third generation, with these chapters of the *Moreh Nebhukhim* can be illustrated by the fact that an anonymous Hasidic anthology bearing the title *Iggereth ha-Qodesh* (s.a.s.l.) incorporated major parts of these chapters (along with other classical texts dealing with *debhequth*, such as passages selected from *Sefer Haredhim*). Further, I would like to draw attention to *Sheney Luhoth ha-Berith* by ISAIAH HOROVITZ (Amsterdam, 1698, p. 120a) which also contains a lengthy discussion on the problem to become so central in Hasidism of practising *debhequth* in conjunction with profane work and arrives at positions similar to the Hasidic ones. Perhaps this section of Horovitz's book is the first serious deviation in Kabbalistic literature from the classical method of contemplation as a leisure-time occupation. It goes without saying that Horovitz's standard work was current in these circles and early Hasidim were no doubt acquainted with it. I hope to give a more detailed analysis of these passages and their relation to the Hasidic ideal on some future occasion.

appears on the scene as a well-to-do tax-farmer (*mahziq kefar*). One may assume that this period of Naḥman's life followed in biographical sequel the one in which, according to the accusation of Rabbi Jakob Emden, he was "an illiterate and a follower of the Sabbatian sect who posed as an itinerant preacher of repentance and was received with great honours."⁴ Whether the accusation was justified or was but another example of the sometimes indiscriminate heresy-hunting in which Emden indulged his boundless energies cannot be decided upon owing to lack of independent evidence. But the suspicions of this ruthless enemy of all Sabbatians have often been proved surprisingly accurate, and historical research should therefore not ignore his gentle hints.

One factual point in Emden's description of Naḥman one need not doubt, namely that Naḥman followed the profession of those itinerant preachers who were wandering about between the scattered Jewish communities of Eastern Europe in a social environment from which the later leadership of the heretical Sabbatian movement and also that of the subsequent early Hasidic movement was largely recruited.⁵ No wonder, therefore, that the figures of these itinerant *Maggidim* and *Mokhiḥim* loom predominant on the pages of *Shibḥey ha-Besht*. The beginnings of Naḥman of Kossov as an itinerant preacher of penitence fit perfectly well into the same social environment. Even though he left his call as preacher to become a tax-farmer, some of the spiritual activities he did not relinquish now as a wealthy man. A brief analysis of what is said about him in the *Shibḥey* might contribute some details to his religious portrait and might also throw some light on the character of the whole group.

We find Naḥman⁶ living in a small village near a town the name of which is not mentioned. The members of the *Habburah Qadisha* to which he belongs live in that town. Geographically somewhat removed from his group he is nevertheless closely associated with it in several ways. He puts the education of his sons into the hands of a member of this circle, Rabbi Arye Leb, the *Mokhiaḥ*, who lives in the town near by. Naḥman's sons have their meals in the *Mokhiaḥ's* house. The father does not pay for their board but provides the

⁴ Quoted by DINABURG, *l.c.*, p. 187, from Emden's *Petah 'Enayim* 14b. Emden is accusing Naḥman of Sabbatianism in *Hithabquth*, Lemberg 1877, p. 80b. Cf. S. DUBNOV, *Toledoth ha-Hasiduth*, Vol. I (1930), p. 102.

⁵ Cf. B. DINABURG, *loc. cit.*, p. 91, and WEISS, *loc. cit.*, pp. 49-56.

⁶ *Shibḥey*, p. 56

tutor with corn and flour from the village—a primitive form of payment which is obviously customary in that environment.

We are told that the tutor of the sons goes to call on Naḥman in the village. The official pretext for this visit is that he has not received his quota of corn and flour as agreed, but the *Mokhiaḥ* has yet another motive for this visit. Our text makes it quite clear that the circle in town has a serious complaint against the behaviour of Naḥman and decided to send one of its members to discuss it with him. The *Mokhiaḥ* volunteered to undertake this mission as he wanted to discuss with him his own personal complaint about the delay of sending provisions in connection with the tuition of the sons.

In the course of the conversation between the *Mokhiaḥ* and Naḥman, as reported in the *Shibḥey*, the following circumstances are revealed. The members of the circle “had agreed that no one of them should prophesy.” Naḥman, according to this complaint, disregarded this agreement of self-restriction in that “he sent word to the members of the *Habḥurah Qadisha*, to every one of them, and let them know what sins each one of them had to rectify (לתקן) in this world. And in everything (i.e. in specifying the sins of each person) he was right.”⁷

Naḥman denies the charge; “I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet.” He explains in a rather lengthy discourse that he did not make use of his prophetic faculties contrary to the mutual agreement of the members of the group, but got into possession of the knowledge needed for the disclosure of his friends’ hidden sins through the medium of a deceased person who died while excommunicated.

In the story related here we are confronted with a circle of pneumatics endowed with the charisma of prophecy. The scope and tendency of the prophetic activities within the group are not clearly defined in our text. However, from the only instance of Naḥman’s prophecy which is discussed in the text it becomes apparent that prophesying was considered as including, or indeed even being identical with, the disclosure of secret sins. Obviously the pneumatic intenseness of this circle was severely reduced after the strange decision of its members to renounce their prophetic powers for some reason which remains unexplained in the text.

הרב המפורסם ר' נחמן מקאסוב . . . והיה שולח לעיר אל בני החבורה קרישא לכאן "א [לכל] אחד ואחד] זה שצריכין לתקן בזה העולם טחטאיו והיה הכל אמת. עד שחרה להם מאד על הנביאות כי היה תנאי ביניהם שלא יתנבא שום אחד מהם, וראו לשלוח [אליו] אחד מהם לשאול מה זה (p. 56)

Notwithstanding the self-imposed silence of the group, its pneumatic climate is tangible. The members of the circle fear the sudden eruption of prophetic faculties at any moment and are determined to suppress it.

Do these people fall into any clearly defined category of the religious history of 18th-century Judaism in Eastern Europe? The answer is that the members of the circle belong unmistakably to that pneumatic type of religious personality which was so abundantly represented in the history of the Sabbatian movement, i.e. to the type of the Sabbatian "prophet."⁸ Although the prophetic scope of the ecstatic Sabbatian *nabhi* embraced more than the mere divulgence of the secret sins of individuals, they did have a strong predilection for using their prophetic faculties in this direction as part of their feverish endeavour to work for the cause of repentance, a preoccupation which followed the Sabbatian movement like a shadow.

Beyond the striking similarity between the religious phenomena of the Sabbatian prophets and of the circle to which Naḥman belongs, the fact that the pneumatic figures in both societies are called by the very same name, i.e. *nabhi*, suggests an historical link. The *derivata* of the root *nba* (in the form of נביאות, מתנבא נביא, נביא) occur in the Hasidic text of the *Shibḥey* in describing the pneumatic activities of Naḥman.⁹ One is tempted to suggest that he and his friends belonged to the last examples of a typically Sabbatian phenomenon in the religious history of later Judaism. G. Scholem ventured to trace back the historical origin of the Hasidic charismatic leader (*Ṣaddiq*) to the Sabbatian prototype of the *nabhi*. In this transformation of a Sabbatian type into a Hasidic one, Naḥman

⁸ On this type of "prophets" cf. G. SCHOLEM, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 1946², p. 334; *idem*, *Ha-tenuah ha-Shabtha'ith be-Polin*, in the Volume "Beth Israel be-Polin" p. 49; *idem*, *The Two first Testimonies on the Relations between Hasidic Groups and Ba'al Shem Tobh*, *Tarbis*, Vol. XX (1950), pp. 238-40, and recently in his monograph on Shabbetai Ṣebhi and the Sabbatian Movement (in Hebrew, 2 vols.), Tel-Aviv, 1957, see Index s.v. גבואה ונביאים.

⁹ The term occurs throughout the anti-Hasidic polemical literature in which the *Ṣaddiqim* are ironically called נביאים or contemptuously שקר נביאי. DINA-BURG in *Sion*, Vol. X (1945), pp. 155-156 (*Be-mifneh ha-Doroth*, pp. 187-188) has collected many such instances to which one could add more, e.g. in the text of *Shebher Posh'im* as emended and quoted by S. DUBNOV, *Toledoth ha-Hasiduth*, Vol. iii, p. 356, or the expression שקר נביא in the ban of Vilna (1772) as applied to R. ISSAR, correctly translated by JOST, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten*, Vol. iii (1859), p. 193: "ein Gelehrter, der sich als Prophet geberdete." The conspicuous absence of any reference to this term in the Hasidic literature is no doubt due to the bad reputation of the word "*nabhi*" and has to be regarded as apologetical silence.

and his friends, belonging as they did, perhaps only peripherically, to both movements have their place.¹⁰

Once it is established that the life of the circle exhibits specific features typical of certain Sabbatian groups—this is further supported by the testimony of Jacob Emden about the Sabbatian past of at least one of the members of the group, i.e. Nahman of Kossov—we may conjecture that the reason for the mutual agreement of the members to renounce their prophetic activities might have had a theological motivation. It might have marked the termination of their adherence to the Sabbatian belief. This interpretation of their puzzling decision to eliminate the practice of prophecy would not be far-fetched in view of the historical transformation of Sabbatianism into Hasidism.

The social structure of the circle can be related to the pre-Hasidic and early Hasidic environment. Dinaburg dealt with the group at some length, describing it as “the circle of Rabbi Nahman of Kossov.”¹¹ It would appear that this description calls for qualification. The vivid picture of the group given in the *Shibhey* does not seem to conform with the structure of the fully developed Hasidic groups attracted by the figure of their charismatic leader,

¹⁰ The author of the *Shibhey* himself notes (p. 7 ed. HORODETZKY) as a typical feature of the Sabbatian movement the prevalence of ecstasies (*meshugga'im*) who torture themselves during the reading of the Torah, and “reveal to the people their sins and state about themselves their own past sins and for which sin they are in transmigration.” The approach of the Hasidic writer to the Sabbatian movement in this context is most remarkable. The author complains about the decline of miracles which he connects with the decline of faith (*אמונה*), a word which, if taken as a technical term, stands for the Sabbatian heresy itself! Far from complaining about the heresy itself, the author is looking at his own generation rather with pity, because it is not privileged to witness the admirable fruits of great faith. The writer appears not in the least embarrassed by the fact that this high tide of faith was connected—in his own opinion too—with the heresy of Sabbatianism. His admiration of and positive attitude to at least the Sabbatian period, if not to Sabbatianism itself—a kind of “those were the days!” attitude—becomes here surprisingly patent. Cf. the expressions: « וְגַם אֲנִי נִתְּחִי אֶל לְבִי כִּי מֵאֵז חֵיטִי לֹאִישׁ וְעַד זָקֵנָה קְרוֹב לְשִׁיבָה שֶׁאִין רֹאֵה בְּעוֹזָה [בְּעוֹנוֹתָיו הָרָבִים] מִדֵּי יוֹם בְּיוֹם נִתְּמַעְטוּ הַנִּסִּים וְנִסְתַּלְקוּ הַמוֹפְתִים. כִּי בַיָּמִים קְדָמוֹנִים אִירַע לִפְעָמִים etc. וְהָיָה בַּעַת שֶׁהִתְעוֹרְרוּ כֵת שְׁבַתִּי צָבִי יִמִּי”ש [יִמֵּה שְׁמוֹ] . . . וְגַם בַּיָּמִיו הָיוּ מְשׁוֹנְעִים שֶׁהָיוּ מְקִיּוּמִים אֶ”ע [אֶת עַצְמָם] בְּאֶבְנִים בְּשַׁעַת קְרִיאַת הַתּוֹרָה וְהָיוּ מְגִלִּים לְאֻנְשֵׁים הַמָּאָם וְהָיוּ אוֹמְרִים עַל נַפְשָׁם הַמָּאָם בְּאִיזָה הַמָּאָם הֵם בִּכְף חֻקֵּל etc. וּמִחֲמַת כָּל אֵלּוּ דְּבָרִים הָיוּ רַבִּים חוֹזְרִים בְּתִשׁוּבָה וְהַאֲמוּנָה הִיָּתָה מִתְחַזֶּקֶת בְּלֵב כָּל אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְעַכְשֵׁיו בְּעוֹזָר נִתְּמַעְטוּ הַצְדִּיקִים וְחֹשֶׁכוֹ הַרְאוֹת בְּאֻרֹּבוֹת. וּבְעוֹזָה נִפְלָה הַאֲמוּנָה עַד מְאֹד וְכַמֵּה מִיָּנוּת נִזְרָקָה בְּעוֹלָם »

One wonders what contemporary heresy the author of the *Shibhey* has in mind after having called the times of Shabbetai Šebhi the days of great faith. N.B. that except for the obligatory formula מ”ש after the name of Shabbetai Šebhi, he makes no derogatory remarks about the Sabbatian heresy. Cf. SCHOLEM *Shetey Iggaroth, Tarbiš*, Vol. XXV (1956) p.438, note 35.

¹¹ *Šion*, Vol. IX, p. 187 (*Bemifneh* etc., p. 161): “רבי נתן מקוסוב ועמד בראשה של חבורה קדישה”

the *Ṣaddiq*, as was the case since the times of the great Maggid, Dobh Baer of Mesritz. Though Naḥman of Kossov clearly exhibits some personal features of the later Hasidic *Ṣaddiq*—he conducts the service in the synagogue in the Sepharadi rite, in a mellifluous voice thus enchanting all,¹² etc.—he is certainly not the head of the group. The structure of a group whereby the leader lives in a village at a distance from the town where the group is centred, able to communicate with its members living there by means of notes only, would itself present an unusual picture. Furthermore, there are other indications that Naḥman was not 'considered the head of the group. Examining the details of the lively conversation between Naḥman and the *Mokhiaḥ*, it becomes apparent that a relationship of co-ordination between the members rather than one of subordination to a leader characterises the social structure of the group. The mutually insulting tone of Naḥman and of the *Mokhiaḥ*, however jokingly employed, calling one another "madman" (*meshugga'*),¹³ would hardly fit into the pattern of relations between a charismatic leader in Hasidism and his follower. One may call this group the "circle of Naḥman of Kossov" for convenience's sake, but one has to bear in mind that in this case "circle" is not used in the Hasidic sense. One could by the same right call it the circle of the *Mokhiaḥ*. The *Mokhiaḥ* and Naḥman and probably the other members of the group also are equals, and Naḥman does not even seem to be *primus inter pares*. The group consists of a loose association of spiritual personalities¹⁴ of equal status whose relationship to one another is one of mutual agreement¹⁵ rather than one resting on an authoritative basis in which the leader

¹² *Shibhey*, p. 57:

וכששמעו הדבורים היוצאים מפיו היו מתוקים מדבש וגופת צופים היו נהנים ושותקים . . . ולאחר קדיש דרבנן התחיל תורו קורם ברוך שאמר

This order of prayers is indicative of the Sepharadi rite. Similarly the hymn which in the Ashkenazi rite is sung only on the High Festivals, was sung by Naḥman on Sabbath morning in accordance with the Sepharadi rite. His enthusiastic manner of praying (*Shibhey*, p. 57) foreshadows the Hasidic practice, but is also in the tradition of Sabbatian groups. Cf. SCHOLEM, *Beth Israel*, p. 64; *idem*, *The Two first Testimonies on the Relations between Hasidic Groups and Ba'al Shem Tobh, Tarbiṣ*, Vol. XX (1950), pp. 237-238.

¹³ *Shibhey*, *ibid.*: . . . בזהל [בוהל] משוגגער נחמן . . . ואמר המוכיח אליו [אל ר' נחמן] בזהל [בוהל] משוגגער נחמן . . . והשיב לו ר' נחמן אתה המשוגע

Naḥman does not appear to be happy about the epithet *meshugga'*, which might have been originally given to him for his ecstatic nature, cf. G. SCHOLEM, *ibid.* p. 239.

¹⁴ Among them R. MOSHE, the head of the Rabbinical court at Kuttov and the ritual slaughterer (*shohet*) who remains unnamed.

¹⁵ *Shibhey*, *ibid.*: היה תנאי ביניהם

dictates and his disciples obey. The *Mokhiah* comes to Naḥman in the name of the whole group and tries to enforce compliance on the part of Naḥman, who, though supposedly the head of the group, accepts their request without questioning its validity. The terms of reference in the debate are the conditions of the agreement. Naḥman's line of self-defence is that he did not commit a breach of the agreement rather than that the other members lacked the authority to control the leader's behaviour. It would therefore be inadequate to project our concept of the later Hasidic "circle" on to this pre-Hasidic group of pneumatic equals. Examined from the point of view of its social structure the "circle of Rabbi Naḥman of Kossov" has a definitely non-Hasidic character.

Nevertheless, there is one distinctive facet of the religious life of the circle which was subsequently to hold a position of central importance in the Hasidic movement, i.e. the place and function of the third Sabbath meal, the *Se'udah Shelishith*. One may attempt to establish a continuity between Naḥman's circle and the Hasidic movement which we found lacking in the social sphere, by examining the character of the third Sabbath meal, as described in detail in the conversation between Naḥman and the *Mokhiah* and reported in the *Shibḥey*. The most striking feature of the meal as described here is that it is not taken in the family circle, but participation in it is meant to render the meal a social occasion. It takes place in the house of Rabbi Moshe, who is the head of the Rabbinical court of Kutov. The participants of this afternoon meal stay at the table long into the night. The time is devoted to discussions on religious matters. There is no light but a numinous darkness surrounds the table though there would have been a perfectly good *halakhic* way of lighting candles after nightfall.¹⁶ It seems that the participants preferred to intensify the atmosphere by staying in darkness. This is keenly felt by a vulgar outsider, the butcher of the town, who is eager for the early termination of the meal which had already been too prolonged for both his religious taste and material interests. He is anxious that the ritual slaughterer of the town, who is participating in the meal, should leave the table and get down to work. In

¹⁶ One of the participants could have recited the evening prayer and kindled the light. This is the accepted practice in synagogues on the termination of the Sabbath, and on this must have rested the much later Galician type of *Se'udah Shelishith* as described by T. YSANDER, *Studien zum Beṭschen Hasidismus*, Uppsala, 1933, p. 316: "Das Torasagen . . . findet beim Belzer Rebbe zweimal bei der dritten Mahlzeit statt, nach dem Einbruch der Dunkelheit und nach dem Anzünden des Lichtes. Man spricht auch von der dunklen und der hellen Tora."

order to bring the *Se'udah* to an early conclusion, the butcher bursts into the room with a candle in his hand, thus dispelling the numinous darkness and thus abruptly terminating the meal, a well-calculated act, for which he died in excommunication.¹⁷ It was his ghost who became the secret informer of Nahman, enabling him to disclose the hidden sins of the members of the whole circle, a practice against which they protested.

The character of this meal strongly resembles, or rather fore-shadows, that of the *Se'udah Shelishith* in the Hasidic environment, which from its very beginnings had a sacramental character and fulfilled a particular social function. It was the weekly highlight of communal religiosity focused on social intercourse.

Already Israel Baalshem is portrayed in the *Shibhey* as presiding and pronouncing his teachings at gatherings of the third Sabbath meal held on a community and not a family basis. His recognition after long struggles at Miedzyboż, where his fame as an itinerant exorcist did not, at first, enhance his social reputation, was marked, according to the *Shibhey*, by the fact that on the first Sabbath after his victory people "came to him to take *Se'udah Shelishith* with him, and he said (at the table) words of Torah."¹⁸ When on one occasion, owing to deep contemplation, Israel Baalshem remained silent during the third meal and the customary teaching at the table was omitted, the disciples were astounded.¹⁹

The interminable length of the *Se'udah Shelishith* is apparently mainly due to the words of *Torah* spoken by the Baalshem at dusk and continued late into the night:²⁰ **פעם א' בסעודת ג' אמר הרב** (i.e. Ba'alshem). The same phenomenon of the prolongation of the *Se'udah Shelishith* which was

¹⁷ *Shibhey, ibid.*

שאתה יודע המעשה שישבתי סעודה שלישית אצל הרב ר' משה אב"ד דק"ק קוטוב והיו מאחרים בתוך הלילה והשוטט היה מאנשי החבורה וישב ג"כ שם. וכא קצב אחד ושמו ליב המכונה ליב גליץ וקרא לחשוט לשחוט פעם אחת ושתיים ושלוש ולא רצה השוחט לילך כי תאב לשמע דברי אלהים חיים. וזה ח' תמיד שיחתם איך לעבוד ה'. וכשראה הקצב שהשוטט אינו רוצה לילך ולהפרד משם, אמר בלבו אבא ואכלל אותם ויתפללו אותם ערבית, וילך השוחט לשחוט, וכן עשה. וכשהביא גר כעם עליו הרב והחרים אותו ומת הקצב.

¹⁸ מיד באותו שבת באו אליו לסעודה שלישית ואמר תורה זו: p. 26.

¹⁹ פעם אחת ישב הרב הבעש"ט בסעודה שלישית והיה טרוד מאד בעמקות המחשבה: p. 111.
ולא אמר תורה בסעודה שלישית כלל, מה שהיה לפלא בעיני התלמידים.
The expression *המחשבה* indicates in the *Shibhey* deep contemplation, cf. p. 108.

וענה הבעש"ט מחלץ בחצר כהכ"ג [בית הכנסת] אנה ואנה וטרוד מאד בעמקות המחשבה.
פעם אחת נכנס בעומק ההתבוננות: והיה הולך אל החרים . . . וכשראו אותו: p. 18.

²⁰ *Shibhey*, p. 108.

mentioned in the description of the third meal of our *Habburah Qadisha* is seen again here in connection with Israel Baalshem.²¹

As to the *Se'udah Shelishith* being a Hasidic institution at least as early as the second generation of the movement we have the independent testimony of R. Jacob Joseph of Polonnoje, the disciple of Israel Baalshem. In one of his sermons he describes the third Sabbath meal as a "gathering and joining of men." Only if we assume that the communal nature of the third meal had already been firmly established could one have written the following words:²²

כוונת האסיפת אנשים והחיבור בסעודה ג' שיתחברו וילוו עלי ליהד ג'
בחי' הנ"ל שהיא עלי בסוד או תתענג על ה' והבן . . . כי ע"י הזווג נמשך
השפע להשפיע מושא"כ [מה שאין כן] כשיושב בסעודה זו בפ"ע [בפני
עצמו] או עשה שבתך חול וכו'.

Immediately prior to this passage, in the very same discourse, R. Jacob Joseph also deals with the first two Sabbath meals, but obviously reflecting the exceptional character of the Hasidic *Se'udah Shelishith* he attributes the distinctive social function to the third meal only.

The colourful description by Salomon Maimon of the "court" of the great Maggid, another disciple of Israel Baalshem, does not leave much doubt that the *Se'udah*, probably the *Se'udah Shelishith*, had at this time already a fully institutionalised character in the Hasidic movement.²³

In the anti-Hasidic regulations of the Galician town Leshnov (1772) the third meal is particularly mentioned as prone to Hasidic influence.²⁴ The anti-Hasidic pamphlet printed upon the publication in 1780 of the book *Toledoth Jacob Joseph* by R. Jacob Joseph of Polonnoje gives unequivocal testimony of the institutionalised form of the *Se'udah Shelishith*, with pronouncement of *Torah* by the *Ṣaddiq*. The pamphlet is probably correct in stating that the book in question came into existence during the *Se'udah Shelishith* sessions of the sect every Sabbath:²⁵ [החסידים] מוסרים וחדושים שדורשים לפי דרכם בתורה בכל פרשה בסעודה שלישית בשבת.

²¹ In all these instances I assume of course that the *Shibhey* is not a late fabrication invented just before its publication in 1815, but that it reflects essentially the way of life of the Hasidic movement during the lifetime of its founder.

²² *Toledoth Jacob Joseph* (ed. 1780), p. 10b.

²³ S. MAIMON, *Lebensgeschichte*, (ed. FROMER) 1911, p. 202 seqq. The meal described by Maimon was held on the Sabbath-day and not on Friday night; DUBNOV, *Toledoth*, Vol. i, p. 86, says it was probably the third meal.

²⁴ Cf. *Zemir 'Ariṣim ve-ḥarboth Ṣurim* (1772), last page: בנידון של סעודות בשבת, וגם שארי סעודות שעושין לעצמם כל בני הקהלה, הלילה לחומין אליהן מן אנשי חבת

²⁵ In the manuscript copy of *Shebher Posh'im* in DUBNOV, *Toledoth ha-Ḥasiduth*, Vol. i, p. 96, note 3.

The pronouncement of Hasidic teachings by the *Ṣaddiq* achieved an institutionalised form within the social framework of the *Se'udah Shelishith*²⁶ instead of being preached in the synagogue or in the *Beth ha-midrash* as was the case in traditional Judaism. One can safely say that the very intimate Sabbath afternoon gathering was the birthplace of all Hasidic teaching and literature. The entire written product of Hasidism, with its short literary units and repetitious oral style, is patently conditioned by this origin. It is a bibliographical fact that nearly every Hasidic book is a collection of speeches made in Yiddish by *Ṣaddiqim* at the table during the *Se'udah Shelishith* and translated into atrocious Hebrew by inexperienced translators in a somewhat haphazard fashion on Saturday nights, a few hours after they had been pronounced.

Returning now to Naḥman of Kossov's circle for comparison, we can observe that, as one might have expected, no pronouncement of teaching by any central figure is mentioned in the text of the *Shibḥey*. As has been shown, the circle had no established leader around whom the adherents would gather and to whose teaching they would listen. Naḥman is certainly not a leader. Since there is no leading figure in the group, there is no authoritative pronouncement of *Torah* by a charismatic leader but conversation and discussion between the members of the group which takes up their time and makes the *Se'udah Shelishith* the prolonged session that it is.²⁷

The pneumatic phenomena of the circle would point to the declining Sabbatian movement, whereas its *Se'udah Shelishith* and some minor issues would put it into close proximity to the Hasidic group. The circle's place appears therefore to be somewhere in the historical no-man's-land between these two movements.

It appears to be possible to locate this circle geographically and identify some of its members from other stories in the *Shibḥey* about a group of "Hasidim" in Kutov which can be supposed on good grounds to be identical with our circle.

²⁶ Cf. DUBNOV, *ibid.*, Vol. iii, pp. 353 and 362-64. Cf. also T. YSANDER, *Studien*, p. 321: "In gewisser Hinsicht ist das Torasagen der Höhepunkt der Mahlzeit"; p. 322: "Sowohl durch den Inhalt als auch durch den traditionengebundenen Platz bei den Mahlzeiten gehört das Torasagen zu den Gebräuchen, die in der religionsgeschichtlichen Charakteristik des Hasidismus beachtet werden müssen." In the later developments of Hasidism the third meal lost its exclusive function as the only time for *Torah*.

²⁷ *Shibḥey*, p. 56: ולא רצו . . . לילך, כי תאב לשמוע דברי אלהים חיים, וזה הי' תמיד שיחתם איך לעבוד ה'.

As we know, our circle gathered on the occasion of the *Se'udah Shelishith* described above at the house of R. Moshe, the head of the Rabbinical court in Kutov. This provides the clue to the identification. Several passages in the *Shibhey* testify to the existence of a group called "Hasidim of Kutov" or "*Hebhrah* of Hasidim of Kutov"²⁸ and to the fact that R. Moshe himself belonged to this group.²⁹ The very name *Hebhrah shel Hasidim* recalls the names by which our circle was called, i.e. *Habhurah* and *Habhurah Qadisha*. It is a reasonable conjecture that the unnamed town in a village near which Nahman is said to have lived and where the other members of the circle were to be found, was Kutov, and that these two groups of pre-Hasidim were in fact one. The rôle which R. Moshe of Kutov plays in both sets of stories strengthens this assumption.

The *Shibhey* reveals that the Kutov group of pre-Hasidim lived in an atmosphere of continual tension with some elements of the community at large. The picture presented is far from an idyllic one of a harmonious Jewish congregation in which a religious *élite* is treated with admiration or at least respect by the rest of the community. The author of the *Shibhey* relates the story that there was in Kutov a man by the name of Tektiner who used to disparage the circle of Hasidim (*ha-hebhrah shel Hasidim*). A certain R. Aaron, the brother of the famous R. Gershon of Kutov, himself the brother-in-law of Israel Baalshem, took up the cudgels against Tektiner and in the course of the argument Tektiner tugged at R. Aaron's beard for which he was excommunicated by the hot-tempered R. Gershon. Soon after he died in excommunication.³⁰

This story, reflecting the tension between the group and its vulgar opponents who are punished by excommunication, exhibits striking similarities to the one recorded above about the butcher of the town who came to disturb the *Se'udah Shelishith* of the circle. It must indeed be regarded as indicative of social conditions in Kutov, and probably in other communities harbouring similar groups. We also hear about a man who became a "ghost" because he derided the pre-Hasidic colony in Kutov.³¹ In spite of the fact that R. Moshe, the Rabbinical head of the community, was associated with the circle, the town's "*Hasidim*" appear to have been

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23, 123.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 22. A. HESCHEL, "R. Gershon Kutover," *HUCA*, Vol. xxiii (1950-51), part ii, p. 18, makes him the leader of the group.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

subjected to constant ridicule on the part of the general society of the town. These rifts must have created a turbulent atmosphere in the community. Apparently many people felt irritated by some of the bizarre forms of piety on the part of these pre-Hasidim.

The same predicament of an eccentric religious minority always on the defensive is the decisive feature of early Hasidic life too. Ridicule rather than hatred was operative there, and the writers of early Hasidism found it necessary to encourage the adherents of the new movement to remain adamant in face of the derision to which their religious *extravaganza* was exposed. From this aspect also the pre-Hasidic circle of Kutov anticipates the later Hasidic state of affairs.

Once the existence of the Kutov circle is established and a preliminary list of its members is drawn up, the relationship of Israel Baalshem to the individual members of the group acquires a new significance and should be studied with reference to the group as a whole.

One thing is patent from the onset: Israel Baalshem made concerted efforts to achieve social and spiritual recognition in this circle. It seems to have been a primary ambition of his to be accepted by the Kutov circle. Even the comparatively parsimonious reports in the *Shibhey* enable us to follow his attempts towards this end.

Israel seems to have had little success with Naḥman of Kossov whom he wooed in order to be accepted as a pneumatic mind-reader, i.e. in some prophetic capacity, which we have seen was the basic quality which united the members of the Kutov group. He was only too glad to be put to the test by Naḥman of Kossov, but he did not succeed in satisfying Naḥman.³² It is very doubtful whether he ever succeeded in gaining Naḥman's recognition although the *Shibhey* is at pains to establish a happy conclusion to such zealous pursuit. In any event, the details of Israel's dealings with Naḥman of Kossov do not constitute a struggle for leadership in the group as Dinaburg³³ held on the basis of his assumption that Naḥman was the leader of the circle. Far from presenting a forthright challenge to wrest the leadership from Naḥman, Israel Baalshem appears on the pages of the *Shibhey* to be humbly yet persistently requesting recognition as a pneumatic personality from a man whose own pneumatic authority is beyond doubt.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 55. Cf. WEISS, *Şion*, loc. cit.

³³ *Şion*, loc. cit.

That R. Gershon of Kutov himself belonged to the circle is not so obvious, though for a while he did live in Kutov.³⁴ He must be pictured as the ascetic type of pre-Hasid,³⁵ but whether or not he was a member of the pre-Hasidic group in Kutov during his sojourn there cannot be proved conclusively. He certainly had contacts with it and had some influence on R. Moshe, whom he was able to persuade, during a visit of the young Israel Baalshem to Kutov, to put the visitor to the test by taking him to a well-known mad woman who had a reputation for prophetic faculties.³⁶ On the other hand, it transpires that R. Moshe and R. Gershon disagreed profoundly about the pneumatic nature of Israel Baalshem, R. Gershon dismissing him as an illiterate³⁷ devoid of pneumatic gifts and R. Moshe giving him help and encouragement.

Israel Baalshem's endeavour to outstep his social boundaries as an itinerant magician and to be accepted on a socially, educationally and spiritually higher level is evident from the strange story of his marriage to the divorced sister of R. Gershon of Kutov in the teeth of the fierce opposition of the latter. This seems to have occurred rather late when R. Gershon had left Kutov and was residing in Brody as a member of the famous kabbalistic *Beth ha-Midrash* ("Klaus"), a position of great honour and testifying to R. Gershon's rising fame. Though Israel Baalshem might have known his future wife from the days when she lived in Kutov, the *Shibhey* gives us no information on this point, and the marriage is described as having been settled between the father and Israel.³⁸ One has to bear in mind that this happened in a cultural environment, blissfully untouched by the romantic idea of love-matches,³⁹ in which marital arrangements generally reflected either existing social ties or social aspirations. In spite of the strong opposition of R. Gershon, the brother of the bride, Israel Baalshem managed to impose himself on this family of the spiritual upper-class by

³⁴ On this figure recently I. HALPERN, *Ha-'aliyoth ha-rishonoth shel ha-Hasidim le-eres Yisrael* (Jerusalem-Tel Aviv, 1946), pp. 11-16; A. HESCHEL, *loc. cit.*, pp. 17-71, G. SCHOLEM, *Shetey 'Iggaroth me-eres Yisrael*, *Tarbiš*, Vol. XXV, (1956), pp. 429-33.

³⁵ I. HALPERN, *loc. cit.*, pp. 11-12. On ascetic figures among the pre-Hasidim cf. SCHOLEM, *MTJM*, 1946², p. 331.

³⁶ *Shibhey*, p. 22.

³⁷ Curiously enough HESCHEL seems to take the story of the *Shibhey* about Israel Baalshem's "hiding" his great erudition at its face value. (*loc. cit.*, p. 20).

³⁸ *Shibhey*, pp. 16-17.

³⁹ Cf. J. KATZ, *Marriage and Sex-life in the Late Middle Ages*, *Şion*, Vol. x p. 21 ff.

force of a betrothal contract signed by R. Gershon's father who had since died. R. Gershon, with whom the divorced sister lived, was anxious to prevent by every possible means the penetration into the family of Israel Baalshem, notwithstanding the fact that his sister's value in the marriage-market was substantially deflated owing to the fact of her being a divorcee, and that he would have had to put up with a second-rate candidate in any case. Israel Baalshem eventually succeeded in contriving this marriage which, however, did not give him the social and spiritual acceptance he might have looked for. R. Gershon tried to persuade his sister to divorce her husband and, in spite of their new family relationship, he himself did not mitigate his ruthless scorn and ridicule of Israel. Nevertheless, from his correspondence with his brother-in-law during the last phase of his life in Palestine it would appear that eventually Israel did succeed in his ambition to be recognised by R. Gershon. But that was long after the Kutov period of R. Gershon's life.

The only member of the Kutov circle with whom Israel succeeded in establishing friendly contact was R. Moshe, the head of the Rabbinical court. Furthermore, we are told that R. Moshe lent him a copy of the *Zohar* at his request.⁴⁰ This ambitious choice of reading matter only provoked the scorn of R. Gershon, but R. Moshe gave Israel his protective blessing against insults on the part of R. Gershon and also made him a present of the book, which according to the *Shibhey* he had previously lent him. Whatever we think of the authenticity of the details, it is certain that R. Moshe favoured Israel Baalshem. According to the *Shibhey*, Israel was able to detect by prophetic insight a faulty *mezuzah* on the doorpost of the synagogue in Kutov and this finally secured R. Moshe's recognition of his pneumatic faculties.⁴¹

One does not know what religious issues were discussed in the pre-Hasidic Kutov circle nor does one have the means of comparing the views of the individual members and of establishing whether they displayed that uniformity found later in the Hasidic groups. The case of Israel Baalshem would imply the contrary. Far from an authoritarian imposition by a leader of a ruling on the attitude to be

⁴⁰ *Shibhey*, p. 24.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* An elaborated parallel to this story with the scene transferred to Brody is to be found in *Shibhey*, p. 20. In this novelistic version R. Gershon appears as the head of the rabbinical court in Brody, which he never was (as proved by HALPERN, *loc. cit.*, p. 13, notes 13 and 15), while the other rabbinic figure, corresponding to R. Moshe of the Kutov version, remains an anonymous "rabbi of the community."

taken towards Israel, we find a variety of attitudes prevailing towards him. This can only strengthen the view expressed above that the circle had no leader holding the position occupied by the *Ṣaddiqim* of Hasidic groups. The dominating influence of a charismatic leader is absent here and people retain the right to personal convictions. This is a sharp distinction between the mental climate of this pre-Hasidic circle and that of the Hasidic ones.

It is apparent that Israel Baalshem was anxious to be accepted by pre-Hasidic circles of the time. While he met with defeat in the Kutov group, he was more successful in Miedzyboż where he eventually settled and where he lived until his death. This town too had a pre-Hasidic circle, two figures of which are known to us by name: R. Ze'ebh Kutsis and R. David Porkes. The *Shibhey's* hint that as an exorcist Israel did not at first command the respect of the town's pre-Hasidim⁴² indicates the difficulties he met there in his endeavour to penetrate into this circle and to be recognised by it. But, unlike his parallel attempts at Kutov, his efforts were finally crowned with success.

Through the obscure hints and scattered episodes of the *Shibhey* we can thus dimly perceive the contours of a pneumatic circle in pre-Hasidism which was probably characteristic of the atmosphere of other ones forming the background of the early career of Israel Baalshem.

London-Manchester.

J. G. WEISS.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 25

Mutual Obligations in the Ketubah

ONE OF THE oldest institutions of Jewish law is the deed of marriage, the "Ketubah." The original form of this contract must have been quite similar to the documents which have been preserved among the Aramaic papyri of Elephantine from the fifth century B.C.E. Several clauses used in marriage deeds during the Second Commonwealth have been cited in the Talmud but no complete text is preserved therein. Since the beginning of the present century, however, a considerable number of Ketubah-deeds have been published out of the Kairo Genizah dating from the tenth century C.E. onwards.

At that time there seem to have been in use among the different Jewish communities two major types of Ketubah considering the definition of mutual obligations in marital life. All the deeds begin with the date and place of execution and then go on describing the ceremony of marriage, reciting the amount of the marriage portion and the dowry. Part of the documents conclude thereupon by mentioning the acceptance of the terms by the bride, while others add a parallel undertaking on her part towards the bridegroom.

According to the first type the bridegroom said as follows (the words in brackets appear only in part of these deeds):

"Be thou my wife according to the law of Moses and of Israel. And I will cherish, honour, support (maintain) and bear thee according to the custom of Jewish men who cherish, honour, (support, maintain) their wives in truth. (And I give thee the price of thine virginity, food, clothing and necessities and come unto thee according to the way of the world.) And accepted and became his wife."

This type, which is customary among present-day Jews, is mentioned in a North African Ketubah of 990 C.E., and in Egyptian, Babylonian, Spanish and German Ketubot from the eleventh century onwards.¹ The second type, on the other hand, begins with a declaration made by the bridegroom to the effect that he has

¹ S. ASSAF in Annex to *Tarbiš*, I 1930, p. 53; S. ASSAF in *Tarbiš*, IX, 1938, p. 30; J. MANN, *The Jews in Egypt*, II, p. 94; S. POZNANSKI in *REJ*, 48, 1904, p. 173; A. GULAK, *Ošar Hasheṭarot*; L. M. EPSTEIN, *The Jewish Marriage Contract*.

married the bride (or that he has said to her: Be my wife) and continues as follows:

“And I will support, maintain, clothe, honour and esteem thee according to the custom of Jewish men who support, maintain, clothe, honour and esteem their wives in truth. And agreed to marry him and to cherish, serve, honour and esteem him according to the custom of wives, the true daughters of Israel, who cherish, serve, honour and esteem their husbands in purity.”

The above wording is found in a Syrian Ketubah of the tenth century and in later Ketubot from Palestine, Egypt and unspecified places.² The same scheme is adopted in Karaite marriage documents where the undertakings of bridegroom and bride are further explained. He is said to have married her “by payment of the bride price, by document and by intercourse as written in the law of Moses the man of God and according to the religion of Israel, the pure and the holy,”³ and she undertakes to “hearken unto his voice” and to fulfil her other obligations towards her husband.

The mutual obligations are expressed also in the marriage deeds of the Samaritans which say roughly as follows:

“He will do unto her according to the law of wives and the manner of Israel’s daughters . . . by paying the bride price . . . and he betrothed her and she became his wife . . . and he became her husband. He will do unto her according to the law of men according to the manner of Israel’s daughters as God has said through Moses his servant (*Exodus* xxi: 10). ‘Her food, her clothing, and her intercourse shall he not diminish.’ He establishes her vows and her bonds and makes them void . . . She will hearken to his words and not rebel against his commandment and she will be a help to him . . .”⁴

Now, although it is difficult to reconstruct the original form of the Ketubah text without any earlier documents known, it seems that the obligations of the bridegroom are better preserved in the second type than in the first. It is in the second that we find in the beginning the biblical obligations (*Exodus* xxi: 10) and then additional moral provisions. The first type, on the other hand,

² S. ASSAF in Annex to *Tarbiš*, p. 60; *Tarbiš*, IX, pp. 24, 26, 28; A. GULAK, *loc. cit.*, p. 35; S. ASSAF in *Jerusalem*, IV, 1953, p. 104; D. KAUFMANN in *MGWJ*, 41, 1896, p. 217; M. GASTER in *MGWJ*, 54, 1910, p. 578; S. ASSAF in *Hašofeh le-ḥokhmat Yisrael*, X, 1926, p. 28.

³ M. GASTER, *ibid.*; A. GULAK, *ibid.*—Some of the Rabbanite Ketubot of Palestine say that the bridegroom married her *be-mohar be-matanah u-ve-qidushin* (by paying the bride price, gift and betrothal money), which is apparently phrased against the Karaite formula.

⁴ M. GASTER, *ibid.*, p. 181.

gives the different obligations without any rational order and the words "cherish and honour" (*'eflah we-'ōqīr*) would at least be as suitable for the bride as for the bridegroom.⁵

It is therefore proposed that the older form of the Ketubah read approximately as follows:

"Be thou my wife and I will be thine husband and support and clothe thee according to the custom of Jewish men. And agreed to become his wife, to cherish, serve and honour him according to the custom of the true daughters of Israel."

If the above assumption be correct, we might draw the following picture of the possible development. (1) Basically, the Jewish marriage ceremony was one-sided, although the woman had to agree to the man's proposition. During the oldest period the Ketubah would, therefore, recite only the bridegroom's obligations. (2) At a later period the necessity was felt to add a parallel undertaking on the part of the bride which seemed to have consisted of the reconstructed text and which has been preserved in the Samaritan form. (3) Still later the obligation "to cherish and honour" was taken over also into the clause of the bridegroom's obligations as a moral addition to the legal provisions. This is preserved partly in type 2.⁶ (4) The last step was reached in the first type where the bride's undertaking was dropped altogether, perhaps because it seemed merely to repeat what was said already in the bridegroom's clause.

Jerusalem.

ZEEV W. FALK.

⁵ The difficulty how to explain the word *'eflah* is felt in *Tosafot Ketubot* 63a sub *be-'omer*. The present writer proposes that it originally related to the bride, cf. *Mishnah Ketubot* v: 5. As to the obligation to honour the spouse, it may relate both to husband and to wife, cf. *Bab. Qidushin* 31a, *Yebhamot* 62b, *Baba Meši'a* 59a, *Ḥulin* 84b; but in this context it suits better the latter's obligations.

⁶ Generally, type 2 is less uniform, whereas the Ketubot of type 1 are all very much alike. This seems to confirm that the second type is the earlier one. As to the possibility of Christian influence, cf. D. KAUFMANN, *ibid.*; J. J. RABINOWITZ, *Jewish Law*, p. 178.



A Contemporary Poem on the Appearance of the Zohar

WHILE the position of Todros ben Jehuda Abulafia in the development of medieval Hebrew poetry still remains unclarified, I. Baer has fully established the poet's relationship to the Jewish and Gentile society of his time in Castile, and particularly in Toledo.¹ Baer identified reflections in his poems of the harmonies and discords of Jewish upper-class life. Abulafia's poetry mirrors the atmosphere of the last decades of the thirteenth century in all its secular and religious diversity. The ideals of the great penitential movement which took hold of wide circles of Toledo Jewry along with other, less pious, features of contemporary society come to full expression through the medium of his adaptable pen, as Baer has shown.

The poet's reference to the new religious movement of Kabbalah in Spain is also mentioned by Baer whose view is that Abulafia's knowledge of Kabbalah did not extend beyond the bare elements of the new mystical lore, such as the names of the ten *Sephiroth*. The present note seeks to shed light on a controversy then current within Spanish-Jewish society about the origin and value of the new mystical teaching by discussing one of Abulafia's poems not dealt with by Baer.

Poem No. 797 of the Yellin edition² reads:

שמע אחי וקבל מאמרים / בעין אל מפנינים הם יקרים
מסרום יודעים חכם לחכם / כהנתן בסיני הדברים
והקשב לחברים הדברים / ומקשיבים לקולך חברים
ואל תבעט למען לא שמעתם / סתרים יש, ואין קץ לספרים
שנים הם בעיני החכמים / ויראו חדשים לבקרים.

"Hearken my brother and receive the words, in God's eye they are more precious than pearls. They were passed from one wise initiate to another, as were the words given on Sinai. Hearken to friends

¹ *Todros ben Yehudah ha-Levi u-tequfato*, *Shion*, Vol. II, pp. 19-55; also in his *Toledot ha-Yehudim bi-Sefarad ha-nosrit*, Tel Aviv, 1945, Vol. I, p. 159 ff.

² "*Gan ha-meshalim ve-hahidot*," *The Divan of Don Todros Abulafia*, Vol. II, part 1, Jerusalem, 1934, p. 147. The exact date of the poem cannot be established, since it is to be found in the last portion of poems (Nos. 377-800) collecting material from different times, cf. BAER, *Shion*, *ibid.*, p. 20.

who speak [them to you], and your friends will hearken to your voice.³ Do not spurn them because you have not heard them [before]. There are mysteries and there is no end to books. These are ancient in the eyes of wise men, they seem new only to the cattle."⁴

Abulafia appears in this poem as champion of the new mystical doctrine of Kabbalah which claims to have come down as a tradition from mouth to mouth, like the Oral Law. This is obviously a claim for the antiquity of the doctrine as well as for the oral nature of its transmission. Abulafia makes a special point of stressing the ancient origin of the material. He adjures his public not to reject the Kabbalistic doctrine on the grounds that it is new to them, concluding his exhortation with a witty though insulting allusion to the secret lore's critics.

It remains to be decided whether the ancient mysteries alluded to in the poem are the mysteries of Kabbalah in general or of one Kabbalistic book in particular. The words "there is no end to books" would suggest a recently published book. Moreover one has to bear in mind that the *milieu* of the poet is Castilian Jewry in the late thirteenth century, the very time and the very setting in which the *Zohar* was published in instalments by Moses de Leon.⁵ It is known that the publication of the book gave rise to protracted controversies in the course of which the ancient origin of the *Zohar*, which purported to be the work of R. Shimeon bar Yoḥai of the second century, was called into question. Indeed the Kabbalists more than others were interested in finding out the truth about the origin of the *Zohar* emanating in suspicious circumstances from Moses de Leon's study.⁶ No Kabbalistic book was called into question on the grounds of its late origin other than the *Zohar*. In the light of its emphatic defence of the early origin of the mysteries in question the poem would be best understood as a polemic in support of the authenticity of the *Zohar* and not just as an attempt towards the propagation of Kabbalistic teachings in general.

One need not suppose, however, on the basis of this that the poet held strong views on this subject, for the art of Abulafia, even more

³ Translated here according to Yellin's commentary (ibid. p. 153). The kabbalistic allusions of the poem escaped the scrutiny of the commentator, who understood the poem as referring to the *Torah* in general.

⁴ A pun on *Lament*. iii, 23.

⁵ G. SCHOLEM, *MTJM*, 1946², pp. 186 ff.

⁶ Cf. the testimony of Isaac of Acre reprinted *in extenso* with emendations by I. TISHBY in his *Mishnat ha-Zohar*, Jerusalem, 1949, Vol. I, pp. 29-30.

than that of most medieval poets, was of a highly social character and he was able to adopt the attitude of any particular circle in which he found himself. We do not know to whom he addressed this poem; the inscription simply says "to one of his friends."⁷

As to the identity of this unnamed friend, our poet's contacts with Rabbi Ṭodros ha-Levi Abulafia, one of the leading Kabbalists of his day, are well attested by many poems in the *Divan*. Rabbi Ṭodros' son, Joseph Abulafia, was passionately interested in the authorship of the *Zohar* as we know from the testimony of Isaac of Acre, and driven by suspicion he put Moses de Leon to the test. The latter stood the test successfully and thus Joseph Abulafia was eventually reassured of the antiquity of the *Zohar*. This Joseph was a friend of our Ṭodros, the poet. However tempting the solution might be, one can hardly venture to identify this unnamed friend of the poet with Rabbi Ṭodros or with his son Joseph—they are referred to by name in the dedication of a good many poems—but anyone in that circle might have shared Joseph Abulafia's interest in the antiquity of the *Zohar*, thus making a fitting recipient of the poem.

I should not like to conclude this note without mentioning the possibility of the poem being meant ironically. This would, of course, not affect its historical connections and implications.

London-Manchester.

J. G. WEISS.

⁷ *Gan ha-meshalim*, Vol. II, part I, notes and commentary p. 153.



Current Literature

Qumran Studies, by C. RABIN (Scripta Judaica II, ed. A. Altmann) 1957, ix+135 pp. Oxford University Press. 21s.

The main points of this book were originally put forth in three lectures delivered at Durham University and in a paper read at the Institute of Jewish Studies in Manchester. The book is divided into eight chapters, in which the Author offers an alternative to the now commonly held view that the Qumran community was Essenic. Professor Rabin suggests that the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Zadokite Fragments (the latter being treated as belonging *in extenso* to the former) were produced by a pharisaic sect which arose in the first century A.D. in opposition to rabbinic Judaism. The evidence for this thesis is drawn from occasional allusions in Jewish sources of the Tannaitic and Talmudic periods to the ancient *havurot*, or fellowships, and to the "Holy Congregation," in both of which the author finds points of contact with the Dead Sea community, not only in matters organizational (particularly as regards rules for membership), but also in practices and doctrines. In other words, the ancient fellowships, the "Holy Congregation," and the Qumran Community represent the old, strict Pharisaism, as opposed to rabbinic Judaism, which, according to the author, arose as a result of a general relaxation of the ancient halakhah. Seen in this way, the rise of the Qumran community

was due to a schism within Pharisaism itself, and the Author finds that only thus are we able to understand, on the one hand the large amount of similarities between the halakhah of the Zad. Fragments and rabbinic literature, and on the other hand the differences between the Qumran community and orthodox Jewish circles. In the final chapter Professor Rabin propounds the view that the remnants of the Qumran community survived in Arabia until the time of Muhammad whom it influenced in various ways.

The topics dealt with in this book and the way in which they are treated by the author will no doubt raise numerous objections.

Professor Rabin does not appear to think much of the archaeological evidence which makes it clear that the Qumran community arose long before A.D. 70 and vacated their centre about that time. He does, it is true, in the preface (pp. viii-ix), suggest that in view of the archaeological evidence the sect may go back to pre-Christian times, but then, on p. 66, the date of the sect is placed *after* the destruction of Jerusalem in agreement with the main thesis of the book. It is, therefore, with some amazement that one reads on p. 86 that "the archaeological evidence now rules out any identification of our sect with the Karaites." Professor Rabin does not seem to realize that acceptance of the archaeological evidence also invalidates his own argument. But

this may perhaps be only a point of minor importance—at least with those who are not prepared to recognize the verdict of the archaeologists anyway; but then it would have served his theory better if the author had omitted all reference to this particular point whose acceptance is fatal to his theory.

L. Ginzberg, in his work *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte* (1922), has already treated the points of contact between the halakhah in the Zad. Fragments and rabbinic writings, and S. Lieberman, in an important article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxxi (1952), pp. 199-206, has dealt with the similarities between the Qumran community and the *havurot*. The latter are the main theme of the first chapter of the book under review, but the reader looks in vain in that chapter, or indeed in the whole of the book, for any explicit reference to the brilliant and original contribution in the said article by S. Lieberman.

The latter has already, in an entirely convincing manner, shown that the word *ṭohorah*, which occurs in both the Zad. Fragments and the *Manual*, refers to ritually clean articles, particularly dry foodstuffs (as opposed to liquids). Nevertheless, Professor Rabin takes *ṭohorah* as referring to the common meals of the community (cf. e.g. pp. 11 and 29), although there is no evidence for this meaning of the word. The author's interpretation of *ṭohorah* is in fact tendentious: by interpreting the word in this way he enables himself to establish a difference between the Qumran community and the Essenes (cf. p. 11). But this is not the only example of his

interpreting his proof texts so as to fit his theory; in the present review we can only mention a few.

On p. 5 Professor Rabin interprets Zad. Fragments xiii: 11 as alluding to the examination of one who is already a member of the community about his military prowess, notes that "the neophyte is at no stage examined about his prowess," and finds a difference here from "the Essenes who tested their neophytes for ἐγκράτεια and καρτερία. This argument falls to the ground because (a) Zad. Fragments xiii: 11 does not deal with one who is already a member of the sect, and (b) it does not allude to an examination about military prowess, but simply to the candidate's being suitable or unsuitable for the strenuous life within the community—which is also what Josephus alludes to by using the terms ἐγκράτεια and καρτερία in connection with the neophytes of the Essenes, those Greek terms in that context having no military connotation.

Similarly, on p. 6, Professor Rabin denies that there is anything in the Qumran community similar to Josephus's description of the Essenes (in *Jewish War*, II, viii: 7) that their neophytes swore "not to discover any of their doctrines to others," and it is in agreement with this that the author, on p. 18, in dealing with the rules for membership obtaining in the *havurot*, implicitly suggests that, like the *havurah* halakhah thus also the Qumran halakhah might be known and practised by outsiders *before* applying for membership—this, according to Professor Rabin, denoting a contrast to the Essenes. Nevertheless, *Man.* ix: 17

quite explicitly forbids members of the Qumran community to reveal their particular halakhah to outsiders; on the other hand, on p. 51, dealing with the "Holy Congregation," which was esoteric and ascetic, Professor Rabin, in contradiction to what he has maintained on previous pages, stresses the secretive character of the Qumran community.

Another point clearly directed against the "Essene" theory, is the author's interpretation of *moshav* as a periodically repeated "central conference" (p. 42 and elsewhere), rather than a "session" in the sense of a small, secluded meeting as practised by the Essenes, and Professor Rabin maintains that *Man.* vii: 11 "shows clearly that the session lasted a limited time and was a recurrent event" (p. 103), but (a) that interpretation is not suggested by the phraseology of *Man.* vii: 11; besides (b) many will no doubt fail to see what exactly is the bearing of Professor Rabin's interpretation of the passage concerned on his point that it alludes to a central conference. The author here omits a reference which is fatal to his argument, viz. *Man.* vi: 3-4 which refers to the session of a small local group; and the phraseology of *Man.* vi: 4 is closely similar to that of *Zad.* Fragments xiv: 6—one of Professor Rabin's proof texts.

Furthermore, the author is anxious to prove that the Qumran community was not organized on communistic lines, as were the Essenes, and he mentions (in ch. II) the various points which suggest that the members of the community had private property. It is admittedly one of the striking

things in the *Manual* that some passages suggest that communal ownership was practised at Qumran, and other passages equally clearly presuppose private ownership, the latter having been dealt with by M. H. Gottstein, in *Vetus Testamentum*, iv (1954), pp. 144 ff. Professor Rabin finds no difficulty in assuming a combination of communal and private ownership within the Qumran community (see p. 31), but why should it be necessary then to take *Man.* vi: 25 as alluding to "a fine paid at regular intervals and fixed at a quarter of the income" (p. 26)—without mentioning the difficulty in the use of the word *lehem*? Again, the interpretation of "the property of the community" as "arms stored up for the holy war" (p. 30) is quite unnecessary, cf. the author's own remarks on p. 32 where he suggests that at least some members of the *havurah* (and of the Qumran community, cf. n. 2), "were maintained by common funds at the centre." Why then should the biblical idiom (cf. 2 *Kings* xv: 20) used in *Man.* vi: 20 be translated "bring it out to the Many" (i.e. divulge details of the neophytes's property, see p. 31), rather than "spend it on the Many" which is what the phrase means?

Even the author's remarks on matters philological are in many cases extraordinary. The author is strangely puzzled by the trifling problem mentioned on p. 27, n. 1, and the observation on p. 61, n. 3 will startle many, especially English, readers. How can the evidence produced on p. 46, n. 1, support the translation "always" of *kevar*? Who would be con-

vinced by the extraordinary suggestion on p. 54, n. 2? Where in the New Testament does *προφήτης* mean "teacher" (cf. p. 55, n. 3)? Why is it pointed out that the plural form *'amme ha-arašot* is rabbinic (p. 62, n. 2) when it occurs already in the Bible (*Neh.* x: 29)? *Alah* is not reserved for judicial oaths in the Scrolls (cf. p. 61, n. 4), see *Man.* ii: 16. And so on.

In this book Professor Rabin has carefully collected and quoted the rabbinic passages which deal with the ancient Jewish fellowships and the "Holy Congregation," but the persuasiveness of the argument that these circles are related to, or survivals of, the Qumran community is greatly impaired by unfortunate and inconclusive reasonings, and by the fact that much of the comparative material is irrelevant.

P. WERNBERG-MOELLER.

R. MACH: *Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrash*. Leiden. 1957. XIII+222 pp. (with Supplements, 245 pp.).

The Midrash does not belong to the category of popular legends which came into existence spontaneously and which owed their origins to anonymous authors or to the creative imagination of the people. The bulk consists of artificially created material with strong ethical, theological, polemical, apologetical, historical, sociological or similar motivations. The possibility that certain *motifs* were borrowed from surrounding cults and lores can never be excluded, but outward similarities alone are not sufficient to explain midrashic

themes, especially a "guiding conception" like that of the *šaddiq*. Unlike medieval authors who judaized non-Jewish doctrines contradictory to the main beliefs of Judaism, the Midrash hardly uses any legends connected with paganism in a converted form. If the *Haggadah* did accept some *motifs* from Hellenistic sources, they had been judaized by the Alexandrian school before being adopted (see Treitel: "Die Alexandrinische Lehre von den Mittelwesen," *Judaica: Festschrift Herman Cohen*, Berlin 1912, pp. 177).

To regard the *šaddiq* as *theios anēr*, as the Author suggests, has no foundation whatever even in the conception of Jewish Hellenists. It is plainly absurd to see no other difference between the *šaddiq* and the "divine man" except in that the former is not the initiator of a new religion or religious theory. Before entering into any comparative study, one has first to elucidate the typically Jewish aspects of the *šaddiq*. The Author is right in saying (pp. 57-8) that there is no possibility of arriving at a comprehensive view on the basis of a single exceptional source, yet despite the fact that the majority of sources on p. 76, note 7 give one view, he bases a long comparative study on quite a late single source (p. 74). Examples of divorcing a source from its context are to be found on p. 42, note 2; p. 133, note 11; p. 196, note 5. We do not find any reason why these *motifs* were not explained in connection with the context in which they appear.

There are many statements in the Midrash about the closeness of the *šaddiq* to God in the world-

to-come. They still fall short, however, of the *motifs* of *apotheosis* (p. 210). They represent the typically Jewish concept of *devequt* which has little to do with the Asian mystery-religions or with Egyptian influence.

We need not go to Mithraism for an explanation of the *motif* of the "a \bar{q} arah (crown) on the heads of the righteous" (p. 210). The "crown" signifies the excellence derived from Divine influence (also from the study of Torah), and is a very frequent symbol (cf. *b. Shab.* 88a, b; *ibid.* 87 b; *Abot* 4, 13).

The fundamental failing of the work under review is its complete neglect of the intrinsic aspects of the Jewish concept of *šaddiq*. Most of the material has already been dealt with (by Aptovitzer, Bacher, Marmorstein and others), yet our Author makes very little use of previous researches and much less of their scholarly conclusions. Some important features of the *šaddiq* are not mentioned at all (even though they have a real bearing on comparative religion).

Nothing is said about the superior position of the penitent in relation to the perfectly righteous (*b. Ber.* 34b). This does not fit into the prejudiced notion of *šaddiq* as "divine man." Pedagogical aspects are likewise lost sight of in the work under review. The concept of spiritual degrees and their mode of achievement (the final stage being that of the *šaddiq*) are not mentioned. The *motif* of *benoni* (*b. Rosh Hash.* 16b and more clearly *Abot* 5, 10; also *Test. of Asher* 2, 4), its relationship to *šaddiq*, etc. are missing.

The author's selective tendency is manifested also in his use of

works by scholars dealing with the subject.

For the sake of comparison with the category of *mana*, van der Leeuw is quoted (p. 54, n. 2), without, however, citing his whole definition of *mana*: "It is simply a matter of Power, alike for good or evil" (Eng. trans., p. 26). How does the evil power fit the *šaddiq*? Our author sides with Kittel against Heinemann (p. 82), since he is most anxious to detect everywhere influences of the mystery religions. One recalls the words of the late Prof. Heinemann on this subject (*MGWJ*, Vol. 69, 1925, p. 337): "It is certainly part of the unavoidable weakness of comparative research of cultures, as we see in the case with which we are dealing, that it demands from the investigator that he should abandon the framework of his profession and to hazard with guesswork where sources are not available." This applies equally to the work under review. Our author had access to the sources but did not make proper use of them. It is a pity that from Heinemann's rich contribution to his field he used only one article.

Finally, a word about the two Supplements: One (pp. 223-242) is a separate pleasantly written article on the symbolism of navigation in Rabbinic literature. This work contains much more serious research and indulges less in comparisons based on mere association than the bulk of the book.

Similarly, the Index on the "righteous and wicked" is well arranged. Unfortunately, there is no general index.

S. Lowy.

Evangelium Veritatis. Codex Jung f. VIIIv - XVIv/f. XIXr - XXIIr. Ediderunt MICHAEL MALININE, HENRY-CHARLES PUESCH, GILLES QUISPÉL. Studien aus dem C. G. Jung-Institut, VI. Rascher Verlag Zürich, 1956. XVI+127 pp. and 24 Plates. Fr.90.-

The important text edited in this sumptuous production represents the second of the five Gnostic writings contained in one of the thirteen codices written in Coptic and discovered at Nag Hammadi near the Nile in a manner reminiscent of the story of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Unfortunately, all codices except one are still inaccessible to scholarly research. The MS comprising the text now edited was acquired in 1952 by the Jung-Institut and designated "The Jung Codex" in honour of C. G. Jung in 1953. It has been described and its problems have been discussed by H. -Ch. Puech and G. Quispel in *Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. VIII, 1-2 (1954) and in a book by the same authors jointly with W. C. van Unnik, translated and edited by F. L. Cross, London, 1955. The present edition of the perhaps most interesting of the writings preserved in the Jung Codex makes it possible to study the text in its entirety and to form a better judgment of it than was possible from the quotations adduced in the publications mentioned. The edition presents the original text (on magnificently produced plates), translations of it in French, German and English (one wonders why *one* translation was regarded as insufficient), critical notes (in French), and Greek and Coptic indices.

In the Introduction the Joint Editors give a brief survey of the

discussion concerning the authorship of the *Evangelium Veritatis*. It is generally agreed that this homily reflects the main tenets of the Gnosis of Valentinus (second century C.E.), but it is still undecided whether or not Valentinus himself was the author (as suggested by Unnik) or whether one of his disciples wrote it. Unnik has drawn attention to the fact that our text does not contain some of the more specific features of the fully-developed system of Valentinian Gnosis such as a detailed list of *aëons*, the doctrine of *sophia*, the opposition of the *Demiurge* to the Supreme God, etc. He concluded from this that the work was composed by Valentinus prior to his conversion to a fully-fledged Gnosticism. It would thus represent a more primitive and less developed stage of Valentinian Gnosis, an assumption which does not tally with the Editors' view according to which the treatise may have emanated from a disciple of Valentinus.

The text before us invites comparison with the earliest documents of Jewish Gnosis at our disposal. For the first time it is now possible to study a Gnostic text not from its refutation in Patristic writings (Irenaeus, Tertullian, a.o.) but in its own setting. The kinship of the theosophy of the *Sefer Bahir* with Valentinian Gnosis has long been recognised (see G. Scholem, *Reshit ha-qabbalah*, p. 33). It may be possible to discover a great deal about the perhaps essentially Jewish sources of Gnosticism once the Nag Hammadi texts are opened up in their entirety. Jewish research will have to keep an open eye on developments in this field. A.A.

HANS BIETENHARD, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*. J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1951, 295 pp.

PETER DALBERT, *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus*. Herb. Reich, Evangelischer Verlag, Hamburg, 1954, 148 pp.

KURT SCHUBERT, *Die Religion des nachbiblischen Judentums*. Herder, Wien, 1955, 252 pp.

Post-biblical Judaism has now for some time past been a subject of increasing importance in scholarly research, also amongst non-Jews. Whilst Christian scholars are mostly interested in it as an auxiliary subject to New Testament studies, attention is paid to it from time to time also for its own sake. The three books under review may be said to stand for different types of research: the first two are of a scholarly nature, whilst the third is addressed to the educated public at large and takes post-Biblical Judaism in the widest possible sense. Moreover, the first book treats its subject as a problem of Christian theology, whilst the two others, though not concealing their Christian approach, deal with post-Biblical Judaism as a subject in its own right.

Bietenhard, a lecturer at the Theological Faculty at Berne, sets out to give a survey and explanation of the conception of the world underlying the New Testament and the contemporary Jewish literature, taking the concept of "heaven" and things connected therewith as his starting point. Understandably enough, he confines himself to the study of Jewish *Apocrypha* and *Pseudepigrapha*, the Talmud and

some *Midrashim*. Unfortunately, Bietenhard seems to rely for Talmudic literature on translations only (Strack-Billerbeck, Winter-Wünsche, Bacher and—*lehavdil*—Eisenmenger!). He is singularly unaware of the contributions of Jewish scholars, otherwise he could have learnt something about *Hekhalot* literature from Scholem's *Major Trends*; in the chapter on the use of "Heaven" as a name for God, Marmorstein's *Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God* is not even mentioned—and these are but two instances. Unfortunately, too, a certain bias against Judaism becomes manifest from time to time: on p. 215, e.g. he speaks about the *Apocalypse* as being "often defamed as the most Jewish book of the New Testament." On several occasions, doctrines with which Bietenhard fails to agree are stigmatized by means of an exclamation mark. One finds it hard to condone this kind of argumentation in a scholarly discussion.

Bietenhard's work is written from a well-defined theological standpoint. This does not mean, however, that it is a theological treatise in scholarly disguise; indeed, it offers a careful philological and critical analysis of an extensive material, taking into due account a wealth of modern research. Moreover, Bietenhard is quite successful in showing the theological significance of the concepts with which he deals. Thus, the chapter on "Christ elevated to the throne of God" is based on an interpretation of several New Testament passages and the Ethiopian *Book of Enoch*. According to the New Testament, Christ is elevated to the

throne of God, and he rules the world even in the present time. Bietenhard makes it clear that the ascension has no significance of its own: the eschatological *kerygma* only is important. On the other hand, the Rabbinic sources draw a clear distinction between God and the Messiah, and between God and Metatron (God alone is *seated* on His throne, nobody can share it with Him). Bietenhard rightly suggests that the opposition to Christianity helped Rabbinic Judaism to clearly formulate its own concept. He is right, too, in suggesting (p. 265) that the compilers of the New Testament used to think in terms of "binity" which led Christians to trinity ("The Three leads the Two back to the One," says Bietenhard on p. 159), whilst the tendency to separate, e.g. Metatron from God, is due to gnostic influence (cf. the *Hebrew Book of Enoch*).

On the whole, Bietenhard's book is a valuable contribution to an up-to-date study of Jewish *Apocrypha* and *Pseudepigrapha*. Thanks to its detailed analysis and well-compiled indexes it deserves a place on the reference shelf; it will, in addition, give food for theological consideration and argument.

Quite a different type of research is offered by Dalbert, a Protestant clergyman, in what seems to be a theological doctorate thesis. It deals with the missionary writings of hellenistic Jews, including some apologetical works, for—as Dalbert says on p. 29—decent apologetics may also have a missionary effect. The author has set himself the task to write a theology of the least-known part of hellenistic Judaism, thus refraining from

adding to the already extensive literature on Philo of Alexandria and Josephus. These could not entirely be left aside: Dalbert frequently refers to literature concerning them, without, however, making these references sufficiently valuable for a study of Philo or Josephus.

Owing to the desperately fragmentary character of the literature dealt with in the book under review, the *Einleitungsfragen* (tradition, dating, identity and origin) are given a good deal of space. They are treated with due care, although the author does not claim to be a classical philologist. (It must be noted, by the way, that the printer was even less careful in printing the Greek quotations.) Sometimes one cannot help feeling that a more philological outlook would have done some good. The background of the *Letter of Aristeeas*, for example, is not set out clearly enough, although this work would have served as an instructive example of a Jewish book grown out of Greek soil (collections of sayings attributed to wise men, so-called mirrors of princes). The history of Greek philosophical ideas, too, is allotted much too little space. Although it is certainly true that no philosophical system is to be detected in this literature, the fact is that single, detached thoughts belonging to such systems have made their way into Jewish writers of that period, occasionally in a formulation probably close to the original one. An investigation on such lines might have enlarged the framework, yet Dalbert's work would have become much more worth while. As it is, it looks more like a *catalogue raisonné* of theo-

logical and anthropological ideas than a theology of Jewish hellenistic writers.

Dalbert's book has, nevertheless, its merits; it offers—at last!—a careful analysis of notoriously unattractive writings, together with a good and useful study of their vocabulary, expounding their theological and anthropological doctrines as far as this is possible. Dalbert writes *sine ira et studio*, without any bias, in a sober style (occasionally affected by Swiss idiom). It is not an exciting book, but it offers a sound basis for further research. It will certainly be welcome to scholars who will, however, deplore the lack of an index as a major defect.

Schubert, a lecturer in Hebrew and Aramaic at Heidelberg, does not address the scholar but the student and general reader. As he says himself, his book aims at offering information and serving as a text-book. Scholarship is, therefore, not displayed here, but it is manifest in most parts of the book. The author is not only a theologian but also a philologist, and he deals with his texts in a sober philological way. It is a pity that the scope of the book does not allow for more than a rather sketchy account of trends and doctrines.

After a short survey of the Rabbinic tradition and its development, the author deals with "Jewish Hellenism and the nature of the Rabbinic tradition." Two formulations would appear to be typical of Schubert's insight: on p. 22 he says that Biblical tradition seems to have become intelligible to Philo only after he had translated it into the terms of Greek philo-

sophy, whilst Rabbinic Judaism had to assimilate Hellenism to Rabbinic tradition in order to be able "to answer in an authentically Jewish way the questions posed by the spirit of the age" (p. 13). A large section of the book is devoted to a survey of the most important doctrines of early-Rabbinic Judaism. In the chapter on the philosophy of Judaism in the Middle Ages, Schubert might have paid more attention to the historical context of philosophical doctrines. The section dealing with Hasidism seems to be by far the weakest of the book. The variety of Hasidic thought is obviously unknown to the author. R. Shneur Zalman is mentioned only as a great Talmudic scholar. Such terms as *debhequt*, *kawwanah*, *saddiq* could have been more fully explained and—in some cases—more exactly rendered. The twenty-five concluding pages are devoted to *Haskalah*, Emancipation and Zionism. It is in this section of the book, where Schubert's theological outlook really appears. This is best shown by his view of the fundamental problem of the State of Israel (p. 206): "Israel should be a theocracy but she cannot have a theocratic constitution since she is not ruled by prophets but by politicians. Modern Israel is the anticipation of eschatological Israel."

Schubert's book is written with a deep sympathy for Judaism, based on scholarly research (in which the author has taken part himself), and yet accessible to the general reader. It makes pleasant reading and will, by its apparatus, certainly prove helpful to the student who wants further information on individual subjects. S. LAUER

Studia Patristica. Papers presented to the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1955. Part I (700 pp.); Part II (560 pp.). Edited by KURT ALAND and F. L. CROSS. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1957. DM 96.-

The Patristic Conference which met at Oxford on 24 to 29 September, 1955 was an event in which a fairly large number of Jewish scholars participated. Their contributions as published in the two stately volumes under review range from *Judaica* to the sections *Liturgica* and *Juridica*: R. J. Z. Werblowsky writing on "The Baptismal Rite according to St. Hippolytus," linking it with dualistic conceptions current in certain Jewish circles but rejecting any relationship with Rabbinic doctrines; Prof. D. Daube discussing "The Punishment of Adultery in Jewish Law" in the light of a remark by Origen; and S. Stein dealing with "The Dietary Laws in Rabbinic and Patristic Literature." The interest which these two volumes hold for readers of this journal is naturally not confined to articles by Jewish writers. In the rich section *Biblica* Prof. P. Kahle's paper on "Problems of the Septuagint" and J. Daniélou's on "The Feast of Tabernacles in Patristic Exegesis" (in French) may be singled out as of special interest. Daniélou happily augments an earlier and most fascinating treatment of aspects of the same theme in Hugo Rahner's *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung* (Rhein Verlag, Zürich, 1945, pp. 376-413). Rahner had shown how Patristic writers used the ancient Greek *motif* of the

willow of the brook as a symbol of virginity and chastity in their homilies on the Biblical passages in which this tree is mentioned, especially in their allegorical interpretations of Tabernacles and Ps. 137, 2. He did not raise the question of literary dependence on Rabbinic sources. Nor is there any likelihood of such affiliation, for the praise of chastity as found in Patristic writers is alien to the Jewish tradition. (We may, however, note in passing that the Greek Church opposed radical asceticism, and Methodius of Philippi, though glorifying virginity, also extolled the sanctity of marriage. See Rahner, p. 394, n. 3). Yet the *Lulabh* as symbol of victory (in Origen's *Homilies on Exodus*, IX, 4) occurs already in Rabbinic sources (*Pesiqta de-Rabh Kahana*, ed. Buber, pp. 180-1, and parallels). As Daniélou shows in his more comprehensive treatment of the theme, Patristic authors did make use of midrashic material, especially in their eschatological interpretations of Tabernacles. Unfortunately, his references to Rabbinic sources are extremely meagre and second-hand.

It is the section *Judaica* which naturally concerns us most. R. Loewe's paper on "The Jewish Midrashim and Patristic and Scholastic Exegesis of the Bible" is concerned with two major aspects. It seeks, in the first place, to trace "the mutual stimulation of Jewish and Christian Biblical theology." The few examples adduced by him do, however, hardly justice to the task he set himself. By far more substantial is the second part of the paper which compares the exegetical method-

ologies of Church and Synagogue. It offers a brief outline of the development within Christianity of the four-fold division of Biblical exegesis as expressed in Lyre's famous two-line summary, and shows the reason—or part of it—why the allegorical interpretation has a different function in Judaism from the one it has in Christianity. Loewe hopes that once one has grasped the "mechanics" as it were of Jewish exegesis, one will be able to see its "spiritual" character more clearly. Christian exegetes, especially in the Patristic age, frequently rebuked Rabbinic exegesis for its alleged mere literalness and lack of "spirituality." They held "the conviction that an exegesis that was not christological could not be spiritual." Loewe's aim is to shatter that conviction. He is confident that by looking at Rabbinic *midrash* in the light of the categories appropriate to its own language and faith the Christian will come to recognise its essential spirituality (p. 507). His article is thus tinged with a strong apologetic tendency. Unfortunately, it fails to draw on earlier work of a more independent outlook such as Kadushin's and Isaak Heinemann's writings.

Other articles in the same section are M. Black's on "Messianic Doctrine in the Qumran Scrolls" suggesting that the High Priest envisaged as the ecclesiastical Head of the future Zadokite hierocracy need not be regarded as a "Messianic" figure, as had been suggested by G. K. Kuhn in particular (and, in fact, already by L. Ginzberg). Prof. Black does not consider the fact that belief in two Messiahs,

a priestly and a lay one, is attested also in Karaite literature, as N. Wieder has shown in this Journal (Vol. VI, No. 1, 1955, pp. 14 ff.). A. Levene writes competently on "Pentateuchal Exegesis in Early Syriac and Rabbinic Sources," and J. L. Teicher proposes the identification of the Essenes with the Christians as a tentative hypothesis which, he realises, has still to stand the test of an exhaustive analysis. Finally, O. H. Lehmann deals with "The Mystical Book *Bahir* and its Sources." The problem is a most intriguing one, but its solution is hardly advanced in this short article. That the book was edited towards 1180 in the Provence is undisputed. Whether its bulk was written in the spiritual climate of that period and environment or whether it was imported from the East through channels unknown to us is a question which bristles with difficulties, as Prof. G. Scholem has shown in several places. Scholem himself inclines to the view that the book represents the remnant of an early Jewish Gnosis created by Jews who wished to express genuinely Gnostic ideas in a language appropriate to Jewish monotheism. His preference is based mainly on his own discovery of the book *Raza Rabba*, a mystical Eastern Midrash of the *Hekhalot* type, as one of the sources of the *Bahir*. He does not, however, rule out the possibility of French origin under Catharist influence, especially as far as the *Bahir's* belief in transmigration (*gilgul*) is concerned (cf. *Major Trends*, p. 242; *Reshit ha-qabbalah*, p. 31; *Eranos Jahrbuch*, 1955, pp. 59-60).

Without stating the problem in

all its complexity, Lehmann finds the origin of the *Bahir* in the East, more specifically in Mesopotamia, where the Mandaic religion and Manichaeism held sway in the tenth century, "the time when the oldest strata of the *Bahir* were composed." But this is begging the question and nothing more than a guess with no literary evidence to support it beyond what has already been suggested by Scholem on the basis of the *Raza Rabba*. Lehmann's reference to the imagery of the *Bahir* is not conclusive either. The water symbolism in particular is too widespread a *motif* to allow any geographical location. Nor is it certain that the Catharist movement derived from Mesopotamian Manichaeism. As Arno Borst has shown in his *Die Katharer* (Stuttgart, 1953, pp. 66 ff.), it was from Bulgaria that Bogomil's missionaries went out to Italy and France from the middle of the twelfth century onward. It is they who brought the faith to the Catharists. Lehmann's paper only illustrates the fact that all that can legitimately be said about the riddle of the literary origin of the *Bahir* has already been stated by Scholem. Nothing short of fresh textual discoveries can add anything worth-while to our knowledge.

A.A.

I. F. BAER, *Yisrael ba-'Amim* (Mosad Bialik), Jerusalem, 1955, pp. 144.

Prof. Baer's little volume "Israel among the Nations" bears the explanatory sub-title: An essay on the history of the period of the

Second Temple and the Mishnah, and on the foundations of the Halakhah and Jewish religion. The six chapters of this "essay" embody a course given by Prof. Baer to undergraduates at the Hebrew University and consequently dispense, in the text, with all the heavy paraphernalia of professional scholarship. The reader is expected to follow up the hints given in the notes and to acquaint himself with the author's detailed researches as they have appeared during the last years in the Hebrew Quarterly *Sion*.

Prof. Baer regards the period between the end of the Persian domination and the rise of the Maccabean movement as the most crucial and seminal for an understanding of Pharisaism and Jewish religion. According to him this period saw a creative, positive and organic adaptation to Hellenism, traces of which can still be uncovered in the oldest layers of tannaitic literature as well as in Philo. The positive Jewish response is thus contemporary with the hellenistic challenge, and the author illustrates his thesis by comparing analogies which suggest Jewish transformations of more widespread patterns; e.g. the rôle of the Greek sage and the hasidic *hakham*, the adaptations of orphic-neopythagorean eschatology, the doctrine of a visible and invisible world (e.g. the correspondence of a celestial and earthly sanctuary), the hasidic concept of *dinē shamayim* and the "unwritten law," the Synhedrion and the Areopagus as judicial-sacral institutions etc. Baer adopts the identification *hasidim*

ha-rishonim=Essenes and sees in them leaders of a spiritual movement whose aim was an all-embracing religious society. They represent a simple rural society as it is also reflected in early tannaitic literature; hence also the parallelism with certain Greek laws and customs. Seen from the perspective of the spiritual-ascetic hasidic movement, Christianity appears not so much as a novel departure (in its religious attitude; not, of course, in its Christology) but as a continuation of a Jewish trend. Since the process of "positive" hellenization started right at the end of the Persian period, there is unbroken continuity with Biblical Judaism.

All this should be enough to show that the book is full of interesting suggestions. The question, however, remains how much can be said with certainty about the obscurest period of Jewish history. For aught we know many "hellenistic" traits may be due to earlier, general oriental or Persian influence (e.g. eschatology!); much again may be later and the author's use of Philo and tannaitic material may place their relevance earlier than is legitimate. Equally conspicuous as the use of Philo and the *Tannaim* for demonstrating pre-Maccabean transformation of hellenism, is the author's refusal to draw upon apocryphal literature for light on the period under discussion. In spite of these reservations there can be no doubt that Prof. Baer has given us much food for thought.

Z.W.

The Code of Maimonides. Book Eight. The Book of Temple Services. Translated by M. LEWITTES. Yale University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 1957. 52/- net.

The volume under review fully lives up to its predecessors in the Series. It offers a successful translation, with a short introduction and notes which make the book usable even by non-scholars. The merit of the translation can be appreciated only by those familiar with the difficulties of such texts, and with the hardship of dressing Semitic conceptions in Western garb.

One may voice some objection to the rendering in the past tense of the present participles used when laws are stated (e.g. '*osin, bonin*, etc.) Without entering into the question as to the importance, theologically or otherwise, which the translator attaches to this text, scholarly precision demands loyalty to the original. The Mishnaic participle, which was accepted by Maimonides, is a legal imperative which replaces the "Thou shalt" of the Bible.

The Introduction will give the reader a good understanding of the character of the work. Regrettably the author (relying most probably on the promised 15th Volume of critical appraisal of the Code) made it too short. One would have expected a few words on its influence, and on the comparison of this with other codes. Even the uniqueness of the book (not having parallels in the *Shulhan 'Arukh*) has not been properly stressed. Similarly, a reference to the explanation by Maimonides in the *Guide* (III,

45-46) of the problems dealt with in the *Code* would have revealed more of the personality of *Maimonides*.

The notes are illuminating and most valuable, especially for those not at home in this type of literature. Most stimulating are the notes which point out certain (unfortunately not all and not even some important) controversies of *RABD* (e.g. treatise I, Chap. II, par. 8.; treatise I, Chap. VI, par. 16, etc.). Sometimes a linguistic question affecting the translation is not mentioned in the notes (e.g. I, Chap. I, par. I *hogegin elav* is translated as "pilgrimage" without a reference to the difficulties of the expression and its Arabism; *ibid.* para. 2, *bet 'olamim*, permanent, perhaps lit. eternal? etc.).

The attractive form of the book, its diagrams of the Temple, indices, glossary, and Scriptural references make it a useful guide to the understanding of the Temple and its worship.

S. Lowy.

GEORGES VAJDA, *L'amour de Dieu dans la théologie juive du moyen âge*. Etudes de philosophie médiévale, ed. ETIENNE GILSON, vol. XLVI. Paris. Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin. 1957. 307 pp.

The publication of this most recent work of Professor Vajda's must be hailed as a major event in the history of Jewish studies. For not since D. Kaufmann wrote his *Geschichte der Attributenlehre* (1877) has a central theme of medieval Jewish thought been presented in so comprehensive and masterly a fashion. The Love of God in its

dual aspect as God's love of man and man's love of God is a subject which lies at the very heart of Judaism. It is prominent in the Bible, Rabbinic literature, medieval Jewish philosophy, Kabbalah and Hasidism. Strangely enough, it has hardly been treated until now. Professor Vajda deserves our warmest thanks for having filled this *lacuna* in his own competent and superb manner. One is confident that this book will achieve the rank of a classic and will be widely appreciated by scholars and cultivated laymen alike. It wears its immense learning lightly and gives a vivid impression of the many facets of the subject and the importance which attaches to it in the vast array of literary sources analysed. Its scope, though limited to medieval Jewish theology up to the end of the Spanish period, is wide enough to cover the most important ground, especially as the first part (pp. 17-67) contains an ample discussion of the theme in the Bible, Apocrypha, Liturgy, Talmud and Midrash, and the second and main part includes besides a full treatment of the philosophical literature also a substantial chapter on the German Hasidim (pp. 149-162) and one on the older Kabbalah (pp. 191-232). The inclusion of kabbalistic material clearly illustrates the advance which since the days of David Kaufmann Jewish research has made as a result of the efforts of G. Scholem and his school. Professor Vajda has by his own researches made a valuable contribution to our understanding of a number of thinkers on the borderline between Philosophy and Kabbalah. In the book under review he enters more fully

into Kabbalah proper. In dealing with philosophical authors he could happily draw on much of his earlier work in that field, especially his studies on Sa'adya, Bahya ibn Paqudah and Juda b. Nissim ibn Malka. One of the important features of his work lies in the frequent references to sources extant only in MSS and utilised here for the first time.

One might have wished to see the theme of the book treated in a systematic rather than chronological order. *Motifs* such as the love and fear of God, the election of Israel, *debhequt*, the role of the 'aqedah, the interpretation of *Canticles*, etc., would seem to lend themselves to a coherent presentation. A glance at the subject index shows how frequently these *motifs* appear in the book, and one may be inclined to think that individual chapters could have brought out a certain development of these themes in terms of Jewish *Geistesgeschichte*. Yet on second thoughts one cannot but agree with the author's chosen method of presenting each thinker on his own, although this involves a certain amount of disjointedness. For in this way full justice has been done to the various shades of doctrines in their own natural setting. The result is that we can appreciate them on their own homeground as it were and at the same time, thanks to the ample indication of sources and the general characterisation of trends, also see the larger background.

It is inevitable that in a work of such wide compass there is some room for minor criticisms. Thus one misses references to the theme in the *Hekhalot* literature where it

plays some part. Of Karaite writers Aaron b. Elijah ('*Eṣ Hayyim*', pp. 33-4) might have been mentioned in view of the paucity of available sources. Ibn Gabirol's poem *Ahabhtikha* has been fully treated not only by F. P. Bargebuhr but already by D. Kaufmann (*Studien über Salomon Ibn Gabirol*, pp. 116-123), whom Bargebuhr did not mention either. In the survey of thirteenth-century philosophical writers Shemtob ibn Falaquera (*Sefer ha-ma'alot*) might have been included. Vajda reproduces a large passage from the short version of the *Sefer Ḥasidim* which he asserts is based on the passage on the Root of Love in the *Sefer Roqeah*. But the striking erotic simile (which does not occur in the *Roqeah*) is taken from another work by Eleazar of Worms. The passage occurs in *Sefer Raziel* (ed. Amsterdam, p. 9a) which contains part of Eleazar's *Sodē Razayya*.

One of the most interesting aspects of the book is the rich exploit it offers from the literature commenting on *Canticles*, especially the extensive MS material (e.g. Commentaries by Abraham b. Isaac Ha-Levi Tamak, Moses b. Isaac Halayo, Yohanan b. Isaac Alemano, whose *Hesheq Shelomoh* is incomplete in the printed edition, Livorno, 1790, yet fully extant in a British Museum MS., etc.). One can only re-echo Vajda's hope that S. Salfeld's monograph on the subject will soon find a worthy successor bringing the material up to date. Vajda's work will certainly help to stimulate research on this and other kindred subjects bearing on the spiritual aspects of Jewish theology.

A.A.

M. WALLENSTEIN, *Some Unpublished Piyyuṭim from the Cairo Genizah*, pp. XIV+123. Manchester University Press. 21s.

The book under review contains a brief general introduction into characteristics of payṭanic literature such as acrostics, rhyme, rhythm, contents, language and grammar. The original contribution of the author consists of an edition of a number of *piyyuṭim* written by Samuel ben Hoshana, a member of the Palestinian Sanhedrin and a liturgical poet of the ninth and tenth centuries. The poems have been culled by Dr. Wallenstein from the collections of Genizah fragments in Oxford, Cambridge and the British Museum. The texts have been vocalized and arranged according to their formal structure. They are followed by an English translation and by an extensive commentary. In addition, a *Yosher* edited by M. Z. Weiss in 1929 has been identified by Dr. Wallenstein as composed by the same Samuel ben Hoshana. Indices of newly coined words, of emblematic expressions, subject-matter, authors, biblical and rabbinic references conclude the volume.

With few exceptions, this branch of literature has been accessible in Hebrew and German only. It is, therefore, important and meritorious to introduce the English-speaking public to the methods of research in this field, which have been adopted by Zunz, Elbogen, Davidson and Zulay. Moreover, these poems present so many difficulties that only a fully annotated translation can reassure the reader about their contents and coherence.

In some cases the English trans-

lation is not quite clear nor does it seem to meet the full intention of the *payṭan*. The *Zulath* section, e.g. on p. 27 reads כָּנֹס עִם לֹא אֱלֹמֵן. This should be translated, "Gather the people that is not widowed," i.e. whose God is alive. Dr. Wallenstein's "Gather the widowless people" gives the impression that husbands will not die and women will no longer be widows, though the relevant reference in *Jer.* li: 5 is quoted in a note.

In the *Yosher* on p. 30 מִימְנֵי יִקְרֵם לְגִדּוּלָן the rendering "my right-handed one (Ephraim) will precede his elder (brother Menasseh)" does not convey the *double entendre* of מִימְנֵי, which stands also for the best, the chosen one, as, e.g. in *Horayot* 12a הַמֵּשִׁיחַ הַמְיוֹמָן שֶׁבַּמְשׁוּחִים.

Towards the end of the *Ophan* on p. 33 we read טוֹב לִבְרוּ חַי וְקִים וְנִצְחָהּ שְׂרָפִים לְצַפְצָפָה. Dr. Wallenstein renders it "The Benefactor alone lives and endures for ever, Seraphim glorify Him, making Him illustrious." In spite of the note *ad loc.* there seems no reason to change the usual meaning of צַפְצָף in similar contexts of payṭanic literature, viz. to chirp, twitter, sing sweetly. A reference to Gabirol's famous *Reshut* שְׁנֵאנִים קוֹל יִצְפָּצֵף may suffice: וְשִׁיר יִרְצֵף מִחֲנֵה שְׁלִישִׁיָּה. The root *nṣḥ*, too, has a musical connotation (cf. I *Chronicles* xv:21).

No emendation from בֵּן to פֶּן is required for the *Zulath* on p. 35. In the text טָכוּם כְּסֹא פֶן יַעֲלֶה מִכּוֹן שִׂיאָו הוֹרָה לְנִשְׂאוֹ בְּבִרוּכֵי God is the subject of the sentence. The translation would then be: "He taught (David) the order of government (his throne), lest his excellency mount up too high, in order to

exalt him amongst his blessed ones" (cf. 2 Samuel, v: 12 and Job xx: 6).

The evaluation of this kind of poetry is still in its earliest stages. Much more material will have to become accessible before standards of literary judgment can be set up and before the theology of these *payṭanim* can be assessed in proper perspective and historical sequence.

S. STEIN.

G. SCHOLEM, *Sabbatai Zevi* (Am Oved), Tel Aviv, 1957, Vols. i and ii, pp. 842.

In his latest *magnum opus*, the two-volumes of *Sabbatai Zevi and the Sabbatian Movement During His Lifetime*, Prof. Scholem presents the first instalment of what is to be an exhaustive and up-to-date authoritative history of one of the most fascinating messianic movements. At the same time these volumes also mark the end of a seminal epoch of basic research, formally ushered in 20 years earlier, in 1937, by Scholem's not only revolutionary but also revolutionizing essay *Miṣvah haba'ah ba-'averah*. The essay inaugurated a new era in Jewish historiography. For not only did it bring to light new facts, illuminate major movements and events in the Jewish past, and reveal hitherto unsuspected developments and connections in theological thinking. It also opened up important new perspectives for the understanding of Jewish history in a much wider sense. If the essay marked a beginning, the present work is already a first summing-up and stock-taking of the solid results achieved by the researches of Prof. Scholem and his school.

What exactly is all the fuss about? The basic facts have been known, or so it seemed, to most of us for a long time: a messianic movement, centred round a young kabbalist rabbi from Smyrna (Turkey) broke out in 1666; it conquered the whole of Jewry within a few months in spite of certain highly unconventional (to say the least) acts of the Messiah; when the Sultan decided to put a stop to the disturbing agitation among his Jewish subjects, Sabbatai Zevi (that was the Messiah's name) preferred apostasy to the crown of martyrdom; this rude shock, though sufficient to cure the majority of their messianic intoxication, yet failed to shake the faith of a good many followers; many of them refused to deny the validity and reality of the messianic stirring they had experienced and witnessed; others rushed into the wildest forms of paradoxical theology and perverse antinomianism; others again decided that it was incumbent upon them to imitate the Messiah's example and apostatize. The trauma was a severe one. Never before had messianic yearning and readiness reached such a pitch and never before had the *dénouement* been so tragically disgraceful, leaving behind it a trail of confusion and ambiguity that bedevilled and demoralized Jewish life for the next hundred years.

In fact, in both orthodox and liberal-rationalist retrospect, the whole business appeared so incredibly disgraceful that it was consistently played down: Sabbatianism was not a major turning point but a mere episode; its main protagonists were either fools or

rascals; adhesion—at least after the apostasy—was less widespread than occasionally suggested and certainly insignificant among the rabbinic élite, and so on and so forth. This “authorised version” was not solely the fruit of apologetic bad faith. It was, as Prof. Scholem could demonstrate, due to some extent to the Sabbatians’ own secretiveness with regard to their clandestine faith and practice and to their own initiative in hiding or destroying documents bearing on their life and doctrines. But patient and indefatigable research, conducted with the vigour and astuteness of a master detective, brought to light a vast amount of Sabbatian theology and kabbalistic theory, testimonies bearing on the organization and social life of the Sabbatian “underground,” as well as incontrovertible evidence to the effect that a very large number of ostensibly exemplary Jews, worthy rabbis, talmudic luminaries and revered saints and kabbalists, were among the “believers” even when Sabbatianism was already persecuted, excommunicated and outlawed. But Prof. Scholem had not only to discover the relevant sources and documents and then to re-write history; he also had to interpret it and render it intelligible.

The substance of the two volumes under discussion is probably familiar to most readers from the condensed presentation of it in ch. 8 of the author’s *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. Now, however, we are given the full details, together with the evidence. Already the first chapters of *Sabbatai Zevi* are a lesson in responsible and balanced scholarship. Prof. Scholem examines the conflicting

messianic ideologies (the utopian-apocalyptic and the rational), compares analogous trends and movements in the Christian world and describes the contemporary European background with its sectarian activity and chiliastic expectation. He also provides a compact and masterly précis of the state of kabbalistic doctrine at the time of the outbreak of the movement. It was in a Judaism saturated with a very specific kabbalistic theology that Sabbatian messianism exploded, and neither the beginning of the movement nor its astounding and paradoxical development afterwards can be grasped without reference to the religious mentality, theological climate and mystical messianism engendered by Lurianic kabbalism. In a brilliantly argued plea for what we might call phenomenological respect for the specific nature of the facts of religious history, Scholem shows the utter inadequacy of some facile attempts at “explaining” a movement such as Sabbatianism in so-called historical or socio-economic categories. Thus even an appeal to the Chmelnitzky massacres of 1648 fails to explain why the Messiah appeared in Turkey and not among Ashkenazi Jewry, and the blunt instruments of Marxist historiography are clearly incapable of adequately dealing with a movement that embraced the merchant-princes of Amsterdam and the “Nagid” of Egypt, as well as the rabble of Smyrna. Perhaps Scholem is evading the real issue here by choosing to fight against windmills, since no sociologist or historian in his right mind would attempt explanations in such crudely naïve terms as “Chmelnitzky-massacres”

or "rich *versus* poor Jews." The historical and sociological interrelations have to be investigated by more subtle methods of analysis and the solutions are often to be found where one does not expect them and certainly not at the most obvious points. But at any rate Prof. Scholem has shown again that the beginning of all wisdom must be the sovereign mastery over the relevant sources and a faithful reconstruction of the facts.

This reconstruction proceeds by careful collection, sifting and weighing of partly conflicting and partly inadequate or doubtful evidence. But the results are startling enough. Sabbatai Zevi is an intellectually average, not to say mediocre, young rabbi, sufficiently fascinating as a person to attract a few friends and colleagues who share his studies and pious exercises. But Sabbatai Zevi also exhibits the characteristic symptoms of mental illness, and here again Prof. Scholem's treatment of the subject is instructive. The psychiatric diagnosis is not elaborated for the sake of completing a biographical or clinical file but for its intrinsic relation with the whole course of the movement and the evolution of its mystical heresy. The Messiah was manic-depressive, i.e. subject to alternate moods of euphoric exaltation and blackest despair and dejection. In less medical and more theological language: he was both filled with the Spirit and also abandoned by God, a prey to the demons. A certain duality, based on the dialectical tension between two opposite poles of existence in the person of its central figure, was thus imprinted on the movement, as its hallmark,

right from the very beginning. Swept by the high tide of his maniac exaltation, a patient is apt to perform the most striking and extraordinary acts. Latent possibilities manifest themselves, magnified and enlarged. Sabbatai Zevi too was wont to do extraordinary, even shocking things (like pronouncing the unutterable Name of God or transgressing the Law) when the "Spirit" was upon him. From the very beginning the need to explain antinomian outbursts and to formulate a pattern combining holy licence with ascetic piety imposed itself on the movement. The paradoxical *tours de force* of the Sabbatian court-theologians after the apostasy were no new departures; they merely were the more thorough and extreme application of paradoxical principles inherent in the movement from its inception.

Sabbatai Zevi was not of the stuff great leaders are made of. He toyed with the idea of messiahship, in his great moments he was carried away by his manic enthusiasm, but ultimately he had neither the stamina nor the stability to carry through a single undertaking. The decisive event in his career was his meeting with the real centre and fire of the movement, the prophet Nathan of Gaza. Nathan, the "John Baptist and St. Paul" of the movement in one, was a genuinely charismatic personality and "recognized" the soul of the Messiah in the youthful Sabbatai Zevi. Like Saul, who had gone out to find she-asses and came home with a kingdom, Sabbatai Zevi came to the celebrated kabbalistic "doctor of souls" in order to be cured of his severe melan-

cholic affliction, but surrendered quickly when the role of Messiah was forced upon him. Nathan became the founder, propagandist and first theologian of the movement. Re-assured by the man of God, Sabbatai Zevi's last inhibitions collapsed. In his manic phases his pathetic and perverse love of ritualism, antinomianism, and craving for paradoxical, shocking demonstrations ran riot. But a mystical theology was at hand to explain everything to the by-standers—and those far away needed no explanations.

For not the least illuminating part of Prof. Scholem's study is his carefully documented account of the incredibly varied impact of messianic news on the different Jewish communities. Perhaps we have already said too much by speaking of "a movement," for there is, at the beginning, no unity of approach or belief. What to Nathan and his followers was primarily an event of a mystical order, to be grasped in kabbalistic terminology and to become fully manifest according to well-defined theological principles, could become in other parts to which the messianic wildfire had spread a farrago of fantastic apocalyptic reports according to which, e.g. Sabbatai Zevi, at the head of mighty armies, was joining forces with the lost ten tribes. The whole house of Israel reeled in a spell of dizziness; fasts were abolished, new feasts were instituted, special prayer books poured from the presses, and excesses of mortification and penitence alternated with excesses of a more joyful character.

After Sabbatai Zevi's apostasy, when Nathan began to elaborate

more systematically the paradoxes of a heretical mysticism, there emerged a pattern of religious thought which was only partly new. For not only did it develop tendencies implicitly present, as has been said, in early Sabbatianism but it took up notions of orthodox kabbalism and pressed them to conclusions which, however shocking when made explicit, point to hidden complexities within kabbalistic thinking. Prof. Scholem is well aware that by uncovering these hidden complexities and their destructive effects, he is actually adding grist to the mill of the dogmatists who have a ready answer to the whole problem: both Sabbatianism and Kabbalah are essentially un-Jewish; they are aberrations (though perhaps interesting ones) that have as much to do with Judaism proper as, say, Christianity. Indeed, the analogies with Christianity are too obvious to be missed. Both movements are characterized by the same outer situation (a messiah who has failed lamentably) and inner attitude (the failure is no failure at all but, paradoxically, the very essence of the messianic mission). Sabbatianism quickly developed a good many of the characteristic Christian ideas, e.g. the stress on personal faith in the Messiah as essential to salvation. Whether these ideas emerged spontaneously by the immanent logic of the religious situation or whether there is specific Christian influence (cf. Nathan's use of *šdq* in the technical sense of *justificatio*) is still a moot question. But the fact remains that Jews, and not the worst ones at that, could accept these ideas as a legitimate ex-

pression of their Jewish experience. Only blind historical dogmatism can presume to lay down what is Jewish and what is not, where a Jewish possibility ends and where an aberration begins. The forthcoming volumes will not only have to show why Emden and Hagiz, following in the footsteps of Sasportas, mercilessly hounded Sabbatians and Sabbatianism, but also why others (among them Moses Hayyim Luzatto) refused to write off the messianic explosion as mere foolery or wickedness. Though criticizing the excesses and errors of the movement, they yet accepted aspects of its theology and found some positive appreciation of its significance. In a number of earlier articles Prof. Scholem has already pointed out the indebtedness of Hasidism to essentially Sabbatian influences. The remaining volumes on the Sabbatian movement may well bring us right to the threshold of the last great religious movement which Judaism has known.

Z.W.

O. S. RANKIN, *Jewish Religious Polemic*, Edinburgh University Press, 1956, viii+256, 18s.

Religious polemics have been going on, as far as Jews are concerned, for about three thousand years. A good part of the Bible is manifestly polemical in tone and intention; in other parts the polemic is implicit. But there are ages when polemical writing blossoms into a major preoccupation and even a major art. The intimate connections of the Church with Judaism, due not only to her Jewish origins and her adoption of the Jewish Scrip-

tures, but also to her theological understanding of herself as the true Israel, the valid successor of the rejected nation in the scheme of salvation—all this gave an added touch of virulence to the debate. So far the Christian contribution to the debate was the one most widely known and most easily accessible and it was thus a happy idea of the late Prof. O. S. Rankin to assemble and translate a number of Jewish polemical documents. The examples are meant to be illustrative of their kind and period, and some, indeed, are classics of Jewish polemic. With others, e.g. the *Chronicle of Moses*, the inclusion seems to be more doubtful; for even if the work is apologetic or polemical in a sense, it shares this characteristic with much midrashic literature. The texts are grouped so as to illustrate a formal division: polemics in narrative (the *Chronicle of Moses*), in poetry (The *Memoir* or poetic précis of Lipman's *Niṣṣaḥon*), in letters (the correspondence between the Christian kabbalist Rittangel and a Jew of Amsterdam) and finally in oral debate (the celebrated disputation of Barcelona, 1263, between Nahmanides and Fra Paolo). Each translation is preceded by a chapter dealing with the background and the participants of the debate, the nature of the document and various critical and exegetical points. The reader will soon discover serious flaws in these introductions and in the notes. Lack of acquaintance with modern research is apparent throughout. Works which nobody would think of quoting today are referred to profusely whereas important authorities are not mentioned at all.

The weakest part in this respect is the chapter on Rittangel which involves a good deal of kabbalistic theory and terminology and in which Scholem's name does not appear once. The same might be said for the disputation of Nahmanides; there is no reference to Baer's important article in *Tarbiš*, II, pp. 172-187.

Since the volume can contribute little or nothing to our study and understanding of the texts, one may well ask whether it would not have been wiser to dispense with the whole *apparatus* and to prepare a popular edition of translated texts for the benefit of the general reader. In its present form the volume fails to commend itself to both scholars and laymen and falls between two stools. But it is an ungrateful task to criticise a posthumous work and Prof. Porteous very rightly saw the MS. through press as he found it. In spite of the aforementioned shortcomings, the late author deserves gratitude for making accessible to a wider public a kind of literature that represents a vital expression of the socio-religious life of our ancestors. The forms of medieval polemic seem quaint and wrong-headed today, but its essence has lost little of its relevance and validity. For the debate continues.

Z.W.

WILHELM MAURER, *Kirche und Synagoge* (Franz Delitzsch-Vorlesungen 1951), W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1953, pp. 134.

As the subtitle (*Motive und Formen der Auseinandersetzung der Kirche mit dem Judentum im Laufe*

der Geschichte) indicates, the subject of this substantial and concise little volume is not the mutual relations of Church and Synagogue but more particularly the attitude of the former to the latter. The main text of Prof. Maurer's study (pp. 9-67) reviews the subject in four stages. The polemics of the early Church, violent as they often were, show no points of contact with classical (pagan, hellenistic) antisemitism; it is a purely "theological" discussion based on a different understanding of Redemption, of Scripture and of the historic role of the now "rejected" Israel. It is only since Constantine and the developing *Staatskirche* and *Kirchenstaat* that Christianity took up again the earlier, non-religious motives of hellenistic antisemitism. The monstrous product of this combination is traced through the early Middle Ages, the Crusades and their aftermath, and Prof. Maurer shows that even Humanism and Reformation did not fundamentally alter the medieval type of antisemitism. The new Biblicism and the interest in Hebrew language and Jewish literature indicate a change of atmosphere within a novel "philosophy of history" but do not materially affect either the religious attitude or the legal position of Jews. Luther's attitude too is composed of two strands: the Protestant theological one which regards the Jew as a fellow-being standing under the "judgment" of God, and the traditional antisemitism of the Church. Only the modern era brought about a really new situation. There was, in the first place, the impetus which the missions received from pietist circles; its

essence was an appeal, out of Christian love, to the individual Jew. On the other hand there was the political, secular Christianity of the nineteenth century (Stöcker), facing a religiously empty Reform Judaism. It paved the way for racial and national antisemitism and the harvest which it reaped in the twentieth century also represents the end, from the Christian point of view, of the development that began with Constantine. 14 Appendices (pp. 68-126) contain the scholarly and bibliographical hints necessary for justifying the expository account of the main text. A bibliography listing 239 items (pp. 127-135) concludes this scholarly and valuable survey. The author deserves also to be congratulated on the discreet and dignified manner in which he adumbrates his own theological position without detriment to his study.

Z.W.

E. STERLING, *Er ist wie Du—Frühgeschichte des Antisemitismus*. Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1950, München.

This study of the history of antisemitism in Germany in the first half of the nineteenth century is a most remarkable achievement in fact-gathering as well as in historical and sociological insights. The study is based on research work in German and Austrian archives. The contemporary press as well as the pamphlet literature has been successfully used. The result is a gloomy picture of the period as far as the Christian relation to the Jews in Germany is concerned. It is seen by the

author as a kind of historical dress-rehearsal of the Hitlerite period. She thinks that the National Socialists drew most of their anti-semitic material from the sources of the period in question, and she is able to substantiate this view by abundant material.

In these sources there is no lack of appeal to the most brutish instincts of the populace, and it is one of the most astonishing theses of this book that this propaganda stemmed from many quarters—liberals and radicals not excluded. One may wonder why at the time this propaganda failed to lead to bloody pogroms, and resulted only in comparatively slight excesses. The answer is, of course, that the state authorities did not lend a hand to the implementation of the antisemitic programme but, on the contrary, protected the Jewish communities from sympathy with them or from a sense of responsibility for the order and welfare of the state at large.

Reading this book one is apt to forget that we deal with a period which led not to the extermination of the Jews but to their political emancipation. This is why doubts may arise in the reader's mind whether the picture offered by the author is a complete one. Concentrating on the antisemitic sources of that time the presentation becomes of necessity one-sided. Not only amongst the liberals but also amongst the conservatives one should be able to find also representatives of a more lenient and humane viewpoint. Was not Ranke, too, a conservative, and nevertheless a judicious judge of the Jewish past and present? Had antisemitic prop-

agenda not been counter-balanced by a more liberal trend, the optimism of Jewish public opinion which prevailed at that time would be incomprehensible. It is sufficient to read some of the articles of Zunz or Riesser to see that although they were aware of antisemitism they believed it to be a residue of an age of religious prejudice. They were convinced that it was on the wane. They obviously relied on some tangible factors in contemporary historical reality.

We may also object to the view of the historical situation as set out by the author. Emancipation was not yet fully achieved, or better still, it had been achieved but was subsequently refuted by the authorities themselves. Public opinion could have regarded it as a mistake on which one had good reason to go back. All those interested in upholding emancipation were fighting for the *status quo* and not for the annulment of the civil and human rights of Jews. Hence the sociological analysis which finds the reasons for the opposition in the general insecurity caused by the industrial revolution is perhaps a little far-fetched. The image of the Jew as a human being and as a citizen had to establish itself first. At the time of National-Socialism this image was already established and modern antisemitism set out to destroy it.

Whatever the connections between the two periods may be, those who experienced the barbarism of the later antisemitism cannot help reading the story of the early period with emotions conditioned by this experience. This happened no doubt to the author of this book and is likely

to be repeated in the case of every reader. This is why this book makes exceptionally exciting reading.

J. KATZ.

L. FUKS, *The Oldest Known Literary Documents of Yiddish Literature* (C.1382). Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1957. 2 vols.

Readers of this journal are already aware of the importance of the Cambridge Codex, both for Yiddish and for German studies (cf. L. Fuks, "The oldest Literary Work in Yiddish in a manuscript of the Cambridge University Library," *JJS*, iv, 1953, 176-181, and F. Norman, "Remarks on the Yiddish Kudrun," *JJS* v, 1954, 85-86.) With great modesty and unselfishness Mr. Fuks has now made his discovery available for others to evaluate and to study. The first of these two sumptuous and expensive volumes contains a facsimile of the manuscript (unfortunately the photograph of page 84 is missing) and a transcription. The second volume provides a transliteration into Latin script and a modern German version which is intended to draw the attention of non-specialists to the codex. It is this translation and a number of statements in the introduction which will provoke violent disagreement among Mr. Fuks's colleagues. For here he comes into conflict with his declared aim of giving us the text of the poems "as the reading eye sees it". The condition of the manuscript is such that the reader must interpret the text as he goes along in order to make out the very letters, and it is, therefore, absolutely essential to establish explicitly the orthographic

system employed by the scribe for the rendering of the MHG or Old Yiddish sounds so that one can arrive at a set of probabilities on which to base readings and conjectures. (Incidentally the orthography is by no means so unique as Mr. Fuks suggests; a linguistically very similar text of 1396-7 has been described by S. Birnbaum in "Das älteste datierte Schriftstück in jiddischer Sprache," *PBB*, lvi, 1932, 11-22 and in "Umschrift des ältesten datierten jiddischen Schriftstücks," *Teuthonista*, viii, 1931, 197-207). Furthermore special difficulties arose for the editor through misunderstanding a passage in Paul-Gierach's *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik* which he quotes on p. xxxiv. (The extraordinary mistake in the author's name is repeated in the bibliography in volume ii.) In its context this refers to the geographical distribution of those consonants which result from the High German sound shift and not to the general ignorance of MHG sounds about which a good deal is known. The present reviewer, in collaboration with Professor F. Norman, hopes to be able to give a detailed description of the orthographic system of the manuscript elsewhere and to assess the position of the *Dukus Horant* in relation to the German *Kudrun* tradition. In the meantime the kind of mistake which results from the absence of an exact linguistic analysis can be illustrated by the following examples which, for reasons of space, will be restricted to the *Dukus Horant*, the most important of the poems.

The name of King אַיטנא is always transliterated as Etten (Eten

on page xxx appears to be a misprint), but final ם represents an unstressed ě or sometimes ð, whereas initial ם can stand for either a closed e or i. Thus two transliterations are possible: Etene or Itene, assuming that final o is unlikely at that date. The one form, however, which is not possible is Etten. This name is particularly important because it is not attested elsewhere in German but has equivalents in Scandinavian and Old English versions of the Hilde story or in references to it.

In line 79 Mr. Fuks reads ןואלען which he translates as Walaise (?). Now our scribe is quite consistent in his use of ץ for MHG ě. ץ can never represent MHG ei which is always rendered as יי. We must therefore read ןואלען (wallaere) which is confirmed by lines 83 and 108.

The following is a list of similar errors and misprints in the text of *Dukus Horant*. (The numerous misprints in the introduction are easily corrected). First of all wrong readings in the transcription in vol. i which are repeated in the corresponding lines of vol. ii. The

many doubtful cases of ןשׁ, כ/ב and so on have not been taken into account.

1.10 שׁונא=שׁונא^װ; 1.27 בידרכא=הובֿשֿר=הובֿשֿר^װ; 1.116 בידרכא=שיפֿא^װ; 1.214 שׁונא=שׁונא^װ; 1.192 מוכטשטן=מוכטשטן^װ; 1.295 פֿיליל=פֿיליל^װ; 1.389 וולוחן=וולוחן^װ; 1.394 פֿיליל=פֿיליל^װ; 1.401 שלקן=שלקן^װ; 1.409 דר=דער^װ; 1.410 גבֿידרא=גבֿידרא^װ

1.423 אישט ריך = one word; 1.457
 פלעגן = פלעגן; 1.477 שונא = שונא;
 1.562 אינר = איינר; 1.661
 הופירטיגשטא = הופירטיגשטא;
 1.759 דש זין = דש זין; 1.885 וואופ(נטא) =
 וואופ(נטא); 1.986 ברדפשמן =
 ברדפשמן.

Next, errors in the transliteration of the poem in vol. ii: 1. 52 'gyb' = gvb'; 1. 66 'vr̥v̥n = vr̥v̥n; 1. 79 vv'le[z]' = vv'le[r]'; 1. 205 sv̥n' = šv̥n'; 1. 318 pfv̥rt̥n = öv̥rt̥n; 1. 322 hv̥bš' = hv̥bš'; 1. 330 v̥v̥n = v̥v̥n; 1. 358 gv̥ilt = g̥v̥ilt; 1. 563 de = di; 1. 604 v̥il = v̥vil; 1. 643 'in = 'ir; 1. 660 v̥ss = v̥vss; 1. 665 lipz̥vm = lip̥ z̥vm. Finally here are some of the most obvious mistakes in the modern German version: 1. 6 Bologna = Apulien (Pulen); 1. 26 war = wurde; 1. 79 Walaise (?) = Pilger; 1. 91 Helena = Ilion; 1. 152 hier = Herr; 1. 161 Gerät = Reitzzeug; 1. 188 mich unterstehen = will unternehmen; 1. 213 Wunder = delete; konnte = kann; 1. 297 herbergen = borgen; 1. 335 waren = sind noch; 1. 341 müsten = müssen; 1. 423 Der ist reich = Der Estrich; 1. 435 Er war = Es wurde; 1. 440 breit = bereitet; 1. 441 den = der; 1. 450 nun = uns; 1. 454 ihr = Ehre; 1. 458 seine Pferde zugleich = sein Pferd sogleich; 1. 466 Traurigkeit = Lärmen; 1. 471 gesandt = sich gerüstet; 1. 489 gehen = zu der Kirche gehen; 1. 492 allzu = so; 1. 505 Leut' = legte; 1. 513 den Leuten = die legten; 1. 546 beistehen = bekämpfen; 1. 549 ihn geschlagen = in sie geschlagen; 1. 574 Mann = Leute; 1. 639 Frau

kommen = Frauen Kemenate gehen; 1. 754 zuvor = zwar (i.e. wahrlich); 1. 772 (?) = Brünne; 1. 781 (?) = Brünne; 1. 797 Mengen (?) = manchen; 1. 798 Schönen = schönen; 1. 806 Rötlin = kleiner Speer.

The question whether the language of the poem is "Yiddish" or "Middle High German" is altogether much more intricate than Mr. Fuks suggests in his preface. There is some evidence in the text to show that *Dukus Horant* is a good deal older than this manuscript. The very word *Dukus* which occurs only in the title and nowhere in the text, where *Horant* is always referred to as a *דירצונא* points to this. But even if the poem should turn out to be closer in time to the manuscript than seems likely it is obvious that the poet was using the technique and vocabulary of MHG epic poetry, so that this purely literary language must have differed considerably from the conversational idiom of the Jewish audience before whom it was recited or sung.

Even more complicated is the relationship of *Dukus Horant* to the MHG *Kudrum*. The name Etene as well as the close links with the story of *König Rother* point to an earlier independent Hilde story as the archetype of *Dukus Horant*; but, in order to settle or at least to clarify these vexed problems we need first of all an exact transcription of the text either into conventional MHG or some other system such as the one employed by S. Birnbaum. It will then be found that a careful analysis of the language and rhymes can fill in some of the gaps in the present text. In the meantime we are grateful

for the facsimile which makes the poems generally accessible and is essential for any further work on the text.

P. F. GANZ

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Edited by F. L. Cross. London, Oxford University Press. 1957. 1492 pp. 70s. net.

This is a magnificent production worthy of earlier Oxford reference books like the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* and others. The Editor deserves our thanks and praise for having created, with the help of an excellent team of scholars, a standard work which will prove of considerable value to the expert and cultivated layman alike. It is sheer pleasure to turn the pages of this rich volume with its over 6,000 entries from "Aaron" to "Zwingli" and its nearly 4,500 bibliographies. No other encyclopaedia in the field can compare with this one-volume work in easy accessibility, and none is as up-to-date. Occasionally one might have wished for a somewhat fuller treatment of important subject-matters. Thus under "Faith" the scholastic definitions are rather curtailed, and Kant figures as the only modern thinker. Also the article on the "Dead Sea Scrolls" is rather scant, hardly anything being said on the theology of the sect. The bibliographies might still be improved. To quote a few examples at random, they should have included A. Vaillant's edition of the Slavonic Enoch (s.v. Enoch, Books of) and a number of more recent works dealing with Maimonides' philosophy (s.v. Maimo-

nides). There are some slight inaccuracies as, e.g. the description of the *Kiddush* on festivals as referring to the Sabbath as well; the statement that America has been the centre of Jewish life already since the nineteenth century (s.v. Judaism). It is also incorrect and a little queer to characterise modern Jewish orthodoxy of the S. R. Hirsch type as a "priestly group" (ibid.), and one may express doubt as to whether the London Chief Rabbinate and the Paris *Consistoire* represent one of the "principal features" of the modern period in Jewry (ibid.).

One appreciates the difficulty of including in a Dictionary of the Christian Church too detailed references to developments in Judaism. After all, in a book of this kind Judaism can figure only insofar as it impinges on Christianity. It is all the more pleasant to find that the range of Jewish influence on Christianity is fairly assessed, and space is given to such subjects as Cabbala, Avicbron (Ibn Gabirol), Maimonides and Martin Buber, apart from a quite lengthy and comprehensive article on Judaism.

A.A.

E. O. JAMES: *The Nature and Function of Priesthood. A Comparative and Anthropological Study* (Thames & Hudson), 1955, pp. 336, 25s.

Priesthood is a complex and many-sided phenomenon, which is another way of saying that it is extremely difficult to give a satisfactory account or definition of it. At the one end it comprises the art of the magician, medicine-man

or shaman, and at the other end it exhibits political forms such as chieftainship, divine kingship and the like. Problems of cult and ritual, prophecy, divination, exorcism, sacrifice, absolution and purification, sacred learning and literature, even jurisprudence, all fall within the scope of an exhaustive discussion of priesthood which must of necessity range from the "heights" of theology to the "depths" of sociology. Prof. James marshals a vast amount of the most diverse material (Primitive Religion; Greek, Roman and old Semitic religions; Israel, Islam and Christianity and—to a lesser extent—India and the Far East) with his customary erudition. It is inevitable in undertakings of this kind that the use of second-hand information and the need for compression leaves an impression of sketchiness and undue simplification (e.g. pp. 256-58 on the development of *halakhah*). Occasionally the account appears to be so cursory as to be confusing and almost misleading. Thus on p. 168 it is suggested that *havurot* were wont to hold communal meals "on the eve of Sabbaths and Holy Days when a cup of wine was blessed and drunk at sunset at a *Kiddush* . . . followed by the passing round of the cup and the solemn (!) washing of hands." On p. 169 it appears that the *havurah* usually closed with the *kiddush*! The confusion is obvious. On the same pages we get the forms *chabruah*, *charuboth*, *charubah* and only once *chaburah*. The volume swarms with misprints, particularly of names (ibn Kladun, Leitzman, Agande instead of Azande etc.), yet it is a skilfully presented and

readable survey of a difficult and confusing subject. As such it should be welcomed by students of Comparative Religion.

Z.W.

E. S. DROWER, *Water into Wine: A Study of Ritual Idiom in the Middle East* (John Murray), 1956, xvi+273, 25s.

Lady Drower has deserved well of students of religion and anthropologists alike by her detailed accounts of ritual and liturgical proceedings in connection with the major themes of sacramental or semi-sacramental food, the religious use of bread and wine, the commemoration of the dead, and the like. Her long experience in the Middle East and her friendship with its many communities have given her unparalleled opportunities for observing, at close quarters, proceedings that are usually hidden from strangers, let alone women. Most occidental readers, familiar as they are with the Western Mass or Eucharist, should welcome the detailed descriptions of the parallel Russian Orthodox, Nestorian, Coptic etc. rites, as well as of such non-Christian sacraments as the Mandaeen *massiqta* or the Parsee *yasna*. Jewish rites are recorded as observed in Jerusalem and Baghdad. The result is an occasionally distorted or, at least, lop-sided picture, inasmuch as general Jewish practice is presented as something specifically oriental. Thus, to pick but one example out of many, the reader may get the impression (p. 47) that the rule of using *mayim shelanu* for the baking of *mašot* is characteristic of Kurdistan and the Yemen!

Altogether the wealth of material presented by Lady Drower only confirms the view that a methodical typology or phenomenology of religion is indispensable if we want our facts to clarify and not to obscure issues. For what has the Jewish cup of wine (whether *kiddush*-, *habdalah*- or wedding cup) to do with sacraments? Or what is the relation of *maṣah* or the "breaking of bread" at a Jewish table with the "Bread of Life"? The fact that no liturgical commemorations of the dead (*hashkabah* or even *kaddish*) involve the use of bread and wine is at least as significant and typical as their use at commemorations during Mass, *dukрана* etc. Of course, both oriental and European (ḥasidic) Jewries exhibit what may be called hints of commemorative "meals," but these belong to the region of folklore rather than of "ritual idiom." Lady Drower has clearly shown that the same "words" can vary their significance according to the "syntax" in which they are used. The motifs of bread, wine, life, holy union, seasonal renewal etc. can combine to form not one but a large variety of "idioms".

Z.W.

FRANZ STEINER, *Taboo* (Cohen & West), 1956, pp. 154. 18s.

These lectures of the late Dr. Steiner, edited by Dr. Laura Bohannon and introduced by Prof. E. Evans-Pritchard, are published as a posthumous tribute to a remarkable scholar whose premature death, at Oxford, at the age of 44 was a severe loss to social anthropology. Adverse cir-

cumstances of all kinds prevented Dr. Steiner from publishing his work during his lifetime and the present little volume well illustrates his acute analytical powers as well as his wit and learning. His critical discussion of the classical theories of Robertson Smith, Frazer, Marett, Wundt, Freud etc. brilliantly shows their inadequacy and limited validity. Considering the proximity of the *taboo* concept to the biblical *qadosh*, Steiner's penetrating analyses of the views of Robertson Smith and Frazer should be of special interest to O.T. scholars. (A rather unfortunate error occurs pp. 85-6 where it is stated that "very often the Bible [sic!] says 'The Holy One blessed be He, or blessed be His name'."") Though unable to provide a positive alternative to the older definitions, the author seems to get as near to a generally valid description of the phenomenon as is possible when he suggests that "taboo is an element of all those situations in which attitudes to values are expressed in terms of danger behaviour."

Z.W.

E. NEUMANN, *The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype* (Routledge & Kegan Paul), 1955, pp. xlv+380 and 185 pp. of plates.

Dr. Neumann is a writer who undoubtedly has some very important things to say, though he may exasperate his readers by the way in which he says them. In fact, the turgidity and heavy obscurities of his style may well cause unsympathetic critics to ask whether the bewildering and am-

biguous hyper-systematization of archetypal symbolism really amounts to anything at all. It is no good to try and disarm such criticism by admitting its validity "to a certain extent" and then asserting that it is "powerless to alter the fact that psychic reality evades our desire for schematic exposition" (p. 83) once an author has, in fact, embarked on the road of "scientific" exposition, complete with charts, labyrinthine diagrams, "axes," "schemas" and the like. However, it would be a pity if by his writing the author should frighten us off what is a really impressive and valuable contribution towards an understanding of the manifold complexity of the mother archetype. No student of either religion or psychology needs convincing of the immense importance of this primeval symbol which continually manifests itself on different levels, in different contexts and—with different significances. Pt. ii in particular, with its discussion of mythological and artistic material (illustrated by 185 pp. of well-produced plates), should be sufficient to demonstrate even to unbelievers the real presence, in the human psyche, of the great reality known as the *magna mater*. Though the author's references to kabbalistic symbolism are few and negligible, the historian of Jewish religion may well feel stimulated to tackle anew the fascinating problem of the utter repression of the Great Mother in Judaism and the nature and significance of her surprising re-emergence in the female symbols of the Kabbalah.

Z.W.

F. SIERKSMA, *De religieuze projectie* (W. Gaade, Delft), 1956, pp. 249.

The publication of important studies in little-known languages is one of the stock occasions for scholarly despair. Already some scholars have decided that the knowledge of Scandinavian languages is an indispensable adjunct to O.T. studies. There is little chance that Dutch will ever become obligatory for students of religion and there is thus every prospect of Sierksma's study of religious projection remaining unnoticed. Yet it is undoubtedly one of the most substantial and original contributions to one of the most central problems of Comparative Religion. The author grounds his whole approach on Plessner's too little known but truly and convincingly valid anthropology (the human structure as the form of "eccentric position"). But whereas philosophical anthropology provides at best a formal skeleton, Sierksma undertakes to clothe it with the flesh and blood of empirical psychology. Starting, as one should start, with the psychology of perception on the animal level, the author shows that projection is merely the specifically human complication (due to the "eccentric structure") of the general problem of perception, i.e. of building up an adaptedness and balanced relation within a "perceptual world." Unfortunately the human, eccentric structure renders such equilibrium unattainable. The world to which man has to adapt himself (having exchanged the "direct," centric form of instinctive adjustment for the eccentric form) is both an outer and an inner world; the two are bridged, eccentrically, by pro-

jections and introjections whose specific operations and contents are determined by social and developmental factors. The author thus provides a broad anthropological-psychological framework within which he can place on the one end the maximum projection in primitive religions and on the other end the extreme Buddhist effort at deprojecting from perceptual reality (but thereby, significantly enough, also dissolving this reality). Between these extremes we find the various High Religions, caught in the tension between primitive projection and theologically (or philosophically) inspired half-hearted deprojection. Extremely illuminating is the author's analysis of the dilemma and ultimate failure of every kind of mysticism. Certain defects of style and composition could easily be eliminated in a translation which, considering the importance of Sierksma's study, must be rated as a "top priority" desideratum.

Z.W.

E. R. GOODENOUGH, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, Bollingen Series, XXXVII, 1953, ff.

A. SCHEIBER, *The Kaufmann Haggadah*, Publishing House of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1957.

C. ROTH, *The Kennicott Bible*, Bodleian Picture Books, 1957.

For many years an incredulous Jewish public has been confronted with Jewish artistic material, and slowly even the most traditional doubters have been convinced, as works on Jewish art and iconography have become more accessible

and the evidence has gained in conclusiveness and richness.

Foremost among these pioneers must be counted Professor Goodenough, whose monumental tomes on Jewish Symbols display a wealth of material, although even they do not claim to present all the available works. What Professor Goodenough is basically interested in is the relationship between mysticism and figural expression, and since it belongs to the nature of the symbol to be ambiguous, other and differing interpretations are possible. Even so, a powerful case is made out for the importance of these symbols and the syncretism of the Graeco-Judaean and Christian world. At the same time, the separate classification of the iconographic subject matter rather tends to obscure the differences between Palestinian and Diaspora art, especially as the latter permeated Rome and from there the South of France, as seen for example in Arles and Aix.

Equally important in a different way is the edition in facsimile of the plates of the Judaeo-Spanish Kaufmann Haggadah, of the end of the 14th or the beginning of the 15th century, because of its outstanding quality. Here it is possible to gauge the richness of an iconographic Jewish tradition, which whilst adapting French and Italian prototypes, clearly belonged to a Spanish School, of which the so-called Serayevo Haggadah and the Crawford Haggadah are earlier members. A short introductory text by Professor Scheiber gives succinct information in what can only be described as rather picturesque English. The Jewish scholar will be grateful for an introductory

appreciation of the personality of David Kaufmann, the late owner of the manuscript.

Lastly, a small pamphlet by Dr. Cecil Roth on the Kennicott Bible should be mentioned, since it will help the general public to obtain some knowledge of the mainly non-representational manuscripts which represent a contrast to the fully illustrated Haggadoth. This bible belongs to the late 15th century, and is perhaps due to a religious reaction against the toleration of images, which however invade the borders and form part of the decoration. The Kennicott Bible is therefore nearer to the still popular conception of the non-figurative character of Jewish art.

HELEN ROSENAU

G. KUNOTH: *Die Historische Architektur Fischers von Erlach*. L. Schwann Publishers, Düsseldorf 1956. Price 44 M.

This beautifully produced volume, the fifth of the monographs published by the History of Art Department of the University of Bonn, gives a detailed account of the antecedents of the earliest comprehensive history of architecture, published in 1721, a typical work of the Baroque, which possesses a parallel in the writings of Giovanni Battista Vico, who gave a systematic expression to earlier trends. Where the work of Kunoth fails is in assessing the influence of Fischer's work, which was translated into French and English, and was for example one of the antecedents of William Chambers's contribution to the history of taste.

For the Jewish reader the parts dealing with the Temple in Jeru-

salem are most interesting; this discussion had been started earlier by Sir Christopher Wren in his so far unpublished Discourse on Architecture and in the notes for four Tracts on Architecture used in Parentalia. The reconstruction goes back to the work of the Jesuit priests Hieronymus Prado and Johannes Baptista Villalpando, "In Ezechielem Explanationes et Apparatus Urbis ac Templi Hierosolymitani Commentariis," where the measurements given in the Book of Ezechiel are regarded as allowing for a reconstruction of the Temple of Solomon. The structure, as represented here, is a typical Mannerist design of about 1600 of great regularity and showing the ground plan and elevation as symmetrical and of beautiful masonry.

Fischer's volume, which was to provide models for the architects as well as a comprehensive survey, also includes the tower of Babel, Egyptian pyramids and Stonehenge as well as the more usual examples of Greek and Roman Temples and other buildings.

The attempt to show continuity and the desire to reveal the underlying similarities of differing architectural forms is the forerunner not only of historical studies proper but also the expression of the rapidly extending world of the Baroque and the appreciation of the time factor in human development.

That Sir Christopher Wren should have been Fischer's precursor in two only partly published works is highly significant since it is in England that the Gothic, that is the medieval tradition, had been kept alive right into the Baroque.

The fact also shows a linking up with the novel ideas of religious tolerance which led to settlement of the Jews in Holland, their resettlement in England, and which is so cogently expressed in B. Picart's "Cérémonies des Juifs" of the same period. It is as a document of culture rather than art history that the Jewish historian will appreciate this publication which illustrates the development of European historical consciousness.

H. ROSENAU.

S. AVISAR, *Teatro Ebraico* (= Thesaurus Litterarum, Sez. 3, Teatro di tutto il mondo, vol. 5), Milano, Nuova Academia Editrice, 1958. 432 pp., 11 plates; price Lire 3.500.

The 140-volume series "Thesaurus Litterarum" is, I believe, the first history of general literature to include Modern Hebrew literature. Avisar, a lecturer at the university of Milan and at the Jewish Teachers' Seminary there, has made a valiant attempt to introduce the non-Jewish reader to Yiddish and Hebrew drama. Playwriting—with Luzzatto, Franco Mendes, Romanelli, Haephrathi and others—was the first *genre* of Modern Hebrew literature, but it has not, as yet, produced truly great works; Yiddish literature produced a great many plays, but only An-sky's *Dibbuk* is of importance. The editor's task was thus not easy. From the Yiddish, apart from the *Dibbuk*, he translated Shalom Alechem's *It is Hard to be a Jew*. His choice of Hebrew plays was apparently dictated by considerations for the Italian reader.

Though he has perhaps not chosen the best plays, he gives a good representative example for each of the three types of present-day play: the grand historical manner in Sackler's *Rahab*; the farce in Ephraim Kishon's *His Name Goes Before Him*; and the serious social play in Mossinsohn's *Casablan*. The translation of each play is preceded by a brief introduction about the author, and the whole book by a 47-page description of the history of the Yiddish and Hebrew theatre and dramatists, giving the plots also of a number of plays not translated in the book.

The work is sumptuously produced and illustrated.

C. RABIN.

H. ROSÉN, *Ivrit tova* ("Good Hebrew: Studies in the syntax of 'correct' Hebrew"), Jerusalem, Kiryat Sefer, 1957. 113 pp.

H. Rosén, lecturer of Indo-European Linguistics at the Hebrew University, continues in his "Good Hebrew" the investigation into the structure of present-day Israeli Hebrew, which formed the main part of his larger work "Our Hebrew" (1956). The material was in part presented in the form of lectures in the Language Hour on *Kol Yisrael*, and is also here expounded in a much more popular and intelligible manner than in the somewhat forbidding structuralist analysis of the former book. Of importance for increasing our understanding of the processes governing the development of the language are above all the last two chapters. One deals with the different ways in which present-day written Hebrew can express the

genitive relation (construct case, *shel*, and *shel* preceded by an anticipatory pronominal suffix) and shows how the language tends towards functional and grammatical differentiation of these inherited forms. It also shows how the construct case blends into the compound noun, and how, at the other end of the scale, certain functions of the genitive are taken over by the ever extending adjective. The chapter is enlivened by apposite quotations, mostly from the daily press, and is altogether a model exposition of a difficult subject. The chapter which precedes it deals with the difference between prepositional phrases and the indirect object and other questions concerned with the use of prepositions. Much of it is an attempt to rectify the damage done by insufficient clarity in these matters in school teaching, but also throws much new light on various points, such as the difference in present-day use between *ke-* and *kemo*, generally said to be synonyms. While this chapter already deals partly with general matters not specifically Modern Hebrew, chapter II is a witty and interesting essay on a general linguistic problem, that of "bracketing" in compound expressions, for which instances in Hebrew are not even particularly frequent.

A large section of "Our Hebrew" was devoted to a justification of the author's study of present-day Hebrew and attacks against those who believe that this Hebrew ought

to be replaced by a type of language more in keeping with linguistic tradition and the teaching of the grammar books, i.e. to matters of linguistic policy rather than of linguistic science. This controversy, too, is carried over into the new book, the first chapter of which endeavours to prove that the fighters for "correct" Hebrew have rather superficial standards, and allow to pass unchallenged a good deal of forms in conflict with tradition just because the "ungrammaticality" is not quite so obvious. He implies that the developments described in the other chapters are in fact such cases. Though some of his examples are telling, the accusation as a whole seems somewhat unjust, since even the linguistic conservative admits of some development, and is obviously entitled to select the ground he wishes to defend. Indeed the alternative of wholesale preservation or wholesale destruction of the inherited structural pattern is taken over from the ideology of the defenders of tradition, as is also the acceptance of the identity of written and spoken language.

A supplementary chapter deals with the problem which elements of the language are essential to the elementary student and in what way they should be taught. This chapter applies in practice some of the theories developed in the book, and is of great interest to the language teacher. The book is very well indexed and clearly printed.

C. RABIN.

Short Notices

CLAUS WESTERMANN, *Der Aufbau des Buches Hiob*, Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, ed. Gerhard Eberling, Vol. 23, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1956, 115 pp.

A valuable interpretation of the Book of Job as representing an "existential" discussion. Only the Elihu speeches belong to the category of Wisdom. They represent a later addition by a theologian who misunderstood the existential character of the book.

Origen, *The Song of Songs Commentary and Homilies*. Translated and Annotated by R. P. LAWSON. Ancient Christian Writers, ed. J. QUASTEN and J. C. PLUMPE, Vol. 26, Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1957, 385 pp., 21/- net.

One welcomes this first English translation of Origen's great *Commentary* and his two *Homilies* on *Canticles* based on the Latin versions by Rufinus and St. Jerome respectively. Rufinus's translation covers the long prologue and the first three (out of the ten) books of the *Commentary* (*Cant.* i: 1-ii: 15). The present edition contains in footnotes also translations of the Greek fragments which are extant in the catena-commentary on *Canticles* ascribed to Procopius of Gaza and appear in the Latin text edition by Baehrens. The importance of this text for a comparative study of Rabbinic and early-Christian allegory is well known. Nothing illustrates more clearly the theological difference between Judaism and Christianity than their different ways of allegorising *Canticles*. In Origen the bride is both the Church and the soul, and the bridegroom is invariably Christ. Unfortunately, the translator has failed to notice the Rabbinic background of Origen's exegesis. The only post-Biblical Jewish source quoted by him is Philo.

Eranos-Jahrbuch 1955, Band XXIV, *Der Mensch und die Sympathie aller Dinge*. Herausgegeben von OLGA FROEBE-KAPTEYN, Rhein-Verlag Zürich, 1956, 518 pp.

Contains G. Scholem's important study of the doctrine of metempsychosis in Jewish Mysticism ("Seelenwanderung und Sympathie der Seelen in der jüdischen Mystik"), a subject previously dealt with by the author in his article in *Tarbis* Vol. 16, 1945, but now considerably enlarged in scope. It traces the development of this doctrine from the *Book Bahir* down to Hasidism. Of considerable interest are also the following studies: Ernst Benz's on the eschatological aspect of the notion of universal sympathy, offering a wealth of material concerning the "vengeful" eschatology of apocalyptic and Christian theology from Tertullian and St. Augustin down to the schoolmen, mystics and Lutherans; and Henry Corbin's analysis of sympathy and "theopathy" in Ibn 'Arabi and Jalalu'l-Dīn Rūmī.

ERNST BENZ, *Adam, Der Mythos vom Urmenschen*, Otto-Wilhelm-Barth-Verlag, München-Planegg, 1955, 328 pp., DM 14.50.

An excellent anthology of texts concerning the Adam Qadmon motif which, as the author points out, derives from (1) the Platonic myth of Primordial Man, and (2) the kabbalistic interpretation of *Genesis*. The selection does not include kabbalistic texts as such. The following authors are represented: Leone Ebreo, Jacob Boehme and his English followers, Emanuel Swedenborg, F. C. Oettinger, Franz von Baader, W. Solowjew, N. Berdaev, and a number of *minores gentes*.

Joachim von Fiore: Das Reich des Heiligen Geistes, ed. ALFONS ROSENBERG. Otto-Wilhelm-Barth-Verlag, München-Planegg, 1955, 154 pp., DM 10.80.

A useful introduction to the teachings of Joachim of Fiore, especially his trinitarian conception of history, which has a certain parallel in the doctrine of the world aeons contained in the *Sefer Temunah*, as G. Scholem was the first to note (quoted by Rosenberg on p. 149). The texts offered in this anthology are culled from Joachim's three main works and translated by R. Birchler. A rather too short bibliography concludes the book.

ERNST BENZ, *Schelling, Werden und Wirken seines Denkens*, Rhein-Verlag, Zürich-Stuttgart, 1955, 119 pp.

HERMANN ZELTNER, *Schelling*, Fr. Frommans Verlag, Stuttgart, 1954, 335 pp.

The most interesting chapter in Benz's book concerns the "Pietist legacy" in German Idealism. It shows how strongly the pattern of the theology of history worked out in Swabian Pietism (A. Bengel, H. F. C. Oettinger) re-asserts itself in Hegel and Schelling. Students of Franz Rosenzweig's philosophy will be particularly interested in this, and Zeltner's, interpretation of Schelling to whom Rosenzweig was so greatly indebted.

MAX SCHELER, *Vom Ewigen im Menschen*, Vierte durchgesehene Auflage, ed. MARIA SCHELER. Francke Verlag, Bern, 1954, 488 pp., Fr. 25.50.

A beautiful edition of this classic expression of Scheler's religious philosophy in his theistic period (1st edition, 1920). Of special importance is the famous essay "Reue und Wiedergeburt" with its illuminating phenomenological analysis of the act of repentance. The volume contains an epilogue by the editor, a list of emendations and additions, notes, a bibliography of Scheler's writings and an index.

FRANZ CUMONT, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, Translated from the second revised French edition by THOMAS J. MCCORMACK, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1956, 239 pp., \$1.85.

FRANZ CUMONT, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*. Authorized Translation. With an Introductory Essay by GRANT SHOWERMAN, Dover Publications, New York, 1956, XXIV+298 pp., \$1.75.

One must be grateful to the Publishers of "Dover Books on Religion and Philosophy" for these re-editions of two of Cumont's works at so cheap a price.

HERBERT GÜNTHER, *Der Buddha und seine Lehre nach der Überlieferung der Theravādins*, Rascher Verlag, Zürich, 1956, 460 pp.

SHORT NOTICES

A re-evaluation of the doctrine of the Buddha on the basis of the original texts and guided by the insights of Jungian psychology. Dr. Günther who showed his competence already in his earlier work, *Das Seelenproblem im älteren Buddhismus* has presented here a truly *magnum opus* of considerable interest to all students of mysticism and comparative religion.

SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY LECTURES

Among recent public lectures given under the auspices of the Society have been the following:

Dr. Erwin I. J. Rosenthal, Lecturer in Hebrew at the University of Cambridge: "Jewish Learning: Reflections on the Second World Congress of Jewish Studies."

Dr. R. J. Z. Werblowsky, Lecturer in Comparative Religion at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem: "Rabbi Joseph Karo and His Maggid."

Dr. Paul Winter: "The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth."

Rabbi Dr. Louis Jacobs: "The Literary Style of the Babylonian Talmud."

Mr. Emile Marmorstein, M.A.: "The Theory of Rule in Jewish Tradition."

Mr. Richard D. Barnett, M.A., Keeper of the Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities at the British Museum: "Assyrians, Babylonians and Jews."

Dr. Siegfried Stein, Reader and Head of the Hebrew Department at University College, London: "The Influence of Symposia Literature on the Literary Form of the Pesah Haggadah."

HUGH HARRIS, *Hon. Secretary.*

Hillel House, London, W.C.1.

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES, MANCHESTER

Stenecourt, Singleton Road, Salford 7, Lancs.

Telephone: BROughton 4027

SPRING TERM, 1958

Seminars for Postgraduates and Advanced Students:

Dr. A. ALTMANN, M.A.: Kabbalistic Interpretations of the Jewish Ritual.

Mr. J. G. WEISS, M.A.: R. Nahman of Braslav's *Liqutei Moharan*. The *Zohar*: Selected passages on the Conception of the *Shekhinah*.

Mr. A. RUBINSTEIN, L.I.M.: Free Will and Sin in the *Pseudepigrapha*.

Mr. S. LOWY, M.A.: Texts concerning Jewish Family Life in the Talmudic Period.

Dr. S. LAUER: Philo's *De opificio mundi*.

Papers read at the weekly Research Seminars:

Mr. J. G. WEISS, M.A.: The Doctrine of Prayer Meditations in Early Hasidism.

Dr. A. ALTMANN, M.A.: The Origin of the Zoharic Doctrine of *Qelipah*.

Mr. S. LOWY, M.A.: The Religious Evaluation of Fasting in Talmudic Literature.

Dr. S. LAUER: Philo's Concept of Providence.

Dr. J. MAITLIS: The *Ma'asseh* in the Yiddish Literature of the Eighteenth Century.

Mr. B. ISSERLIN, M.A.: Aristocratic Lay Mentality in Ancient Israel.

Dr. S. STEIN: Hellenistic Influence in the "Sayings of the Fathers."

**ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
OF GREAT BRITAIN
AND IRELAND**

(Founded 1823)

56 Queen Anne Street, London, W.1

THE SOCIETY'S JOURNAL contains original articles on the archaeology, art, history, language, literature, beliefs and countries of the East as well as reviews of books dealing with those topics.

Applications for membership of the Society should be sent to the Secretary at the above address.

Libraries and non-members can obtain the Journal (approximately 300 pp.) post-free for £3 p.a. (trade price £2. 10s.) or single copies for £1.16s. (trade price £1.10s.) payable to the Secretary in advance.

Taken by libraries in all Continents, the Journal accepts advertisements at the following rates for each insertion: for a full page £5, a half-page £2. 10s., and a quarter-page £1. 5s.

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

New Series

OCTOBER 1957

Vol. VIII, part 2

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

THE SAHIDIC VERSION OF THE TESTAMENT OF ISAAC. By DR. K. H. KUHN

ST. PAUL'S THOUGHT ON THE ATONEMENT. By the REV. D. E. H. WHITELEY

Papa Est Nomen Iurisdictionis: AUGUSTINUS TRIUMPHUS AND THE PAPAL

VICARIATE OF CHRIST, II. By M. J. WILKS

NOTES AND STUDIES

A LOST COLLOQUIALISM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT (1 SAMUEL xxv. 6). By
PROFESSOR G. R. DRIVER

THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES IN THE MURATORIAN CANON. By the REV. DR.
PETER KATZ

THE NEW EDITION OF HERMAS. By the REV. DR. H. CHADWICK

DR. GRABE AND HIS MANUSCRIPTS. By BROTHER GEORGE EVERY

Devoted to the furtherance of theological learning. An issue normally consists of three parts; an original article or articles of some length, shorter notes and studies, reviews of theological works. Issued twice a year in April and October.

Annual subscription 40s. net (post free). Single parts 25s. net. Orders may be placed with a bookseller or sent direct to the Publisher.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C.4.

THE SHARON PRESS

For Good Printing at Competitive Prices

PERIODICALS • BOOKS

CATALOGUES AND BROCHURES

ANNUAL REPORTS

DIRECT MAIL ADVERTISING

COMMERCIAL AND OFFICE
STATIONERY

31 FURNIVAL STREET EC4
HOLBORN 7952

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

CONTRIBUTIONS

MSS. should be sent to the Editor, c/o The Institute of Jewish Studies, Stenecourt, Singleton Road, Salford, 7, Lancs. They should, if possible, be *neatly typed, in double spacing, with a generous margin, on one side of the paper only*. There are about 450 words to each printed page. Any Hebrew used should be either typed, written in square characters, or transliterated. No fee is offered; but contributors of articles will be sent one complimentary copy of the issue in which their article appears together with twenty-five offprints of the article itself. Further offprints may be purchased provided the Editor is informed when the manuscript is submitted to him. Contributors of book reviews will be sent a copy of the Journal. Offprints of reviews may be purchased from the Publishers.

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

Contributors are requested to adhere to the following conventions:

(a) In articles on history, literature, etc., use only the vowel signs *a*, *e* (for *Sere*, *Segol*, and *Shewa*), *i*, *o*, *u*, without diacritic marks. Do not distinguish with *d* and *g* between *dagesh* and *rafe*, write *b* and *v*, *k* and *kh*, *p* and *f*, *t* and *th*. Indicate *dagesh forte* by doubling. Express final ם by *h*. Special letters: ך' (where pronounced), ן *w*, ן *z*, ן *h*, ן *t*, ן *c*, ן *s*, ן *q*, ן *sh*, ן *s* (= ן).

Names etc. for which there is an established English spelling, should of course be written as usual, e.g. *Jacob*, *Jerusalem*, *Kabbala*.

(b) In philological articles only, where an exact transliteration is required, use the following system:

Vowels: *ā*, *ē*, *ā* (*Segol-yod*), *i*, *ō*, *ū*; *a*, *æ*, *i*, *o* (*Qamaṣ qatan*), *u*;
a, *æ*, *o*, *e* (*Shewa*).

Consonants with *Rafe*: *b*, *g*, *d*, *k*, *p*, *t*.

Special letters (other than for system [*a*]): ן *s*, ן *s*.

If desired, write ' (*Alef*) initial and final.

TRANSLITERATION OF ARABIC

Please follow the system of the Royal Asiatic Society, but without underlining the digraphs *th*, *kh*, *dh*, *sh*.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISEMENTS

All communications regarding subscriptions and advertisements should be addressed to the Publishers, JEWISH CHRONICLE PUBLICATIONS, 37 Furnival Street, London, E.C.4, England, who will be glad to send quotations to contributors desiring additional offprints. Binders for Volumes I to V are available at 2s. 6d. each.

PRICE

5s. 6d. (\$0.90) per number

21s. (\$3.50) per annum

DATE DUE	
MAY 9 1994	
MAR 2 1997	
MAR 02 1997	
FEB 03 2000	
JAN 31 2000	
MAR 08 2000	
MAR 03 2000	
GAYLORD	PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
 2400 Ridge Road
 Berkeley, CA 94709
 For renewals call (510) 649-2590
 All items are subject to recall